PATTERNS OF SUPPORT

THE USE OF SUPPORT SERVICES AMONG SENIOR CITIZEN PUBLIC HOUSING TENANTS IN ONTARIO

by:

Margaret A. Denton
Christine K. Davis

With the assistance of
Brenda J. Nussey

SOCIAL DATA RESEARCH LIMITED
Hamilton, Ontario

A Report Prepared For The
Ministry of Housing
Toronto, Ontario
September, 1986

PATTERNS OF SUPPORT:

THE USE OF SUPPORT SERVICES AMONG SENIOR CITIZEN PUBLIC HOUSING TENANTS IN ONTARIO

by:

Margaret A. Denton
Christine K. Davis

With the assistance of
Brenda J. Nussey

SOCIAL DATA RESEARCH LIMITED
Hamilton, Ontario

A Report Prepared For The
Ministry Of Housing
Toronto, Ontario
September, 1986

The Ministry of Housing encourages the use of the contents of this report where the user provides due credit to the authors and publisher.

The views expressed in this report are those of the authors and do not necessarily represent the current or intended policies of any of the government agencies which funded or otherwise supported this study.

© Queen's Printer for Ontario, 1986

ISBN 0-7729-1908-9

Ministry
of
Housing
Ontario

Community
Housing

777 Bay Street
Toronto, Ontario
M5G 2E5

Mr. L. Pitura
Assistant Deputy Minister
Community Housing

October 2, 1986

Dear Mr. Pitura,

On behalf of the members of the steering committee I wish to express our pleasure in presenting the final senior citizen report.

This senior citizen report concludes the steering committee's review of the patterns of support use among senior citizen public housing tenants. The report presents the facts as they were uncovered. To aid in the understanding of the findings presented, we have devoted a separate chapter to the comparison of our findings with those of the United Senior Citizens of Ontario Study.

During the survey, the steering committee and the consulting firm which undertook the fieldwork were very impressed by the commitment made to elderly public housing tenants by project management staff of the local housing authorities involved in the survey.

Steering committee members wish to express their appreciation and thanks to the agencies which funded and otherwise supported this project, Social Data Research Limited which authored the report, Ontario Housing Corporation and local housing authority staff which cooperated and assisted this effort, and especially to the tenants who were interviewed either during the pretesting of the questionnaires or during the survey. Each of these parties contributed substantially to the development and success of this complex endeavour.

Yours sincerely,

George S. Hough,
Steering Committee Chairman

LIST OF CONTENTS

TABLE OF CONTENTS i

LIST OF TABLES v

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS xiii

FOREWORD xv

HIGHLIGHTS xvii

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER 1 INTRODUCTION AND RESEARCH DESIGN 1

1.1 Introduction and Purpose of this Survey 1
1.2 Study Design and Methodology 4

CHAPTER 2 AGENCY SURVEY FINDINGS 6

2.0 Introduction 6
2.1 Methodology 7
2.2 A Description of the Neighbourhood Where Housing Projects for Seniors are Located 10
2.3 Service Providers' Perceptions of Tenant Problems 19
2.4 Support Services Available to Senior Tenants From Community Agencies 21
2.5 The Role of Agencies 24

CHAPTER 3 TENANT SURVEY FINDINGS 31

3.0 Introduction 31
3.1 Background Characteristics, Health Status and Social Networks 32

3.1.A Background Characteristics 33
- i) Demographic Characteristics 33
- ii) Income 36
- iii) Type and Size of Residence 44

3.1.B Health Status 45
- i) Subjective Measures of Health 45
- ii) Number of Health Conditions and Interfering Health Conditions 48
- iii) Type of Health Condition and the Extent to Which Health Condition Interferes With Daily Living 54
- iv) The Extent of Hospitalization Within the Last Twelve Months 56

3.1.C Social Networks 59

3.2 Difficulties With the Activities of Daily Living 64
3.3 Assistance Received With the Activities of Daily Living 72

3.3.A Assistance With Activities of Daily Living 73

3.3.B Frequency of Assistance With the Activities of Daily Living 75

3.3.C Length of Time Help was Received with the Activities of Daily Living 77

3.3.D Duration of Assistance with the Activities of Daily Living 79

3.3.E Arrangements for Assistance with Activities of Daily Living 81

3.3.F Use of Formal Services 83

3.4 Providers of Assistance on the Activities of Daily Living 88

3.4.A Sources of Formal and Informal Assistance 88

3.4.B Differences in the Sources of Assistance Used 92
- i) Age 94
- ii) Household Status 94
- iii) Education 101
- iv) Birthplace and Year of Immigration 101
- v) Total Household Monthly Income 101
- vi) Health Status 108
- vii) Frequency of Social Contacts 112

3.5 Sufficient Help With the Activities of Daily Living 116

3.6 Comparison of the Findings From the Senior Citizen Public Housing Survey to Findings From the Survey of "Elderly Residents in Ontario" 121

3.6.A Comparisons on Demographic and Social Background Characteristics 122

3.6.B Comparisons on Health Status 126

3.6.C Comparisons on the Activities of Daily Living 129

3.6.D Comparisons on the Use of Community Services 132

3.6.E Comparisons on the Sources of Assistance 134

CHAPTER 4 SUMMARY OF FINDINGS 135

Introduction and Purpose of This Survey 135

Study Design and Methodology 136

4.1 Summary of Findings From the Agency Survey 137
4.2 Summary of Findings From the Tenant Survey 140

REFERENCES 151-152

APPENDIX 1 A PROFILE OF THE USE OF COMMUNITY SERVICES BY SENIOR CITIZEN PUBLIC HOUSING RESPONDENTS: THE FREQUENCY OF ASSISTANCE; LENGTH OF TIME SERVICE WAS USED; DURATION OF ASSISTANCE AND; WHETHER THE ASSISTANCE MET THE PERCEIVED NEED A1

A.1.0 Introduction A1

A.1.1 Public Health Nurse or Other Nurse A2

A.1.2 Physical Therapist A6

A.1.3 Homemaking Services A9

A.1.4 Meal Services A13

A.1.5 Footcare Services A16

A.1.6 Vision Services A20

A.1.7 Dental Services A23

A.1.8 Day Hospitals/Clinics A26

A.1.9 Nutrition Counselling A29

A.1.10 Friendly Visiting A32

A.1.11 Special Transportation A35

A.1.12 Housing Project Staff A39

A.1.13 Drop-In Centres A42

APPENDIX 2 METHODOLOGY TABLES FOR THE AGENCY SURVEY A45

APPENDIX 3 METHODOLOGY: TENANT SURVEY A57

A.3.1 Study Population and Sampling Design A57

A.3.2 Census Demographics of Municipalities Surveyed A61

A.3.3 Study Design and Methodology A64

A.3.4 Fieldwork Procedures A66

A.3.5 Response Rates and Biases A67

A.3.6 Sample Bias A71

A.3.7 Coding A73

A.3.8 Data Entry, Editing and Analysis A75

A.3.9 Impressions of the Interviewers A76

APPENDIX 4 TENANT RESPONSE RATES TABLES A77

APPENDIX 5 QUESTIONNAIRES A81

LIST OF TABLES

Table		
2.2.1	Support Service Providers' Perceptions of the Type of Neighbourhood Surrounding the Seniors' Housing Project - Percent of Respondents by Predominant Type of Neighbourhood	11
2.2.2	Support Service Providers' Perceptions of the Type of Residents in the Surrounding Neighbourhood - Percent of Respondents by Predominant Type of Resident	12
2.2.3	Support Service Providers' Perceptions of the Socio-Economic Level of Households in the Seniors' Project Neighbourhood by Municipality	13
2.2.4	Support Service Providers' Rating of Selected Neighbourhood Attributes - Percent of Respondents Indicating Very Good or Excellent by Municipality	15
2.2.5	Support Service Providers' Perception of the Location of Facilities in the Neighbourhood Surrounding the Seniors' Housing Project - Percent of Responses Indicating Within Easy Walking and Transit Distance	17
2.3.1	Support Service Providers' Rating of Selected Tenant Problems - Percent of Respondents Indicating Very Serious or Serious Tenant Problems by Municipality	20
2.4.1	Support Service Providers' Perceptions of Supports Available to Senior Tenants	22
2.5.1	The Frequency With Which Respondents Encountered Obstacles to Support Delivery	27
2.5.2	Support Service Providers' Perceptions of Obstacles to the Delivery of Supports - Respondents Reporting Obstacles Encountered Often by Municipality	28
3.1.1	Senior Citizen Public Housing Respondents by Age	34
3.1.2	Senior Citizen Public Housing Respondents by Education	35
3.1.3	Senior Citizen Public Housing Respondents by Birthplace	37

3.1.4 Senior Citizen Public Housing Respondents by Total Household Monthly Income - January/ February 1985 38

3.1.5 Senior Citizen Public Housing Respondents, Total Household Monthly Income by Sex - January/ February 1985 40

3.1.6 Senior Citizen Public Housing Respondents, Total Household Monthly Income by Household Status - January/February 1985 41

3.1.7 Senior Citizen Public Housing Respondents Total Household Monthly Income by Age - January/ February 1985 42

3.1.8 Senior Citizen Public Housing Respondents by Source of Income 43

3.1.9 Senior Citizen Public Housing Respondents by Their Subjective Rating of Health 46

3.1.10 Senior Citizen Public Housing Respondents by Whether Their Health Problems Stand in the Way of Their Doing the Things They Want to Do 47

3.1.11 Senior Citizen Public Housing Respondents Subjective Rating of Health by Age 49

3.1.12 The Extent to Which Senior Citizen Public Housing Repondents Report That Health Problems Stand in the Way of Their Doing the Things They Want to Do 50

3.1.13A The Number of Health Conditions Reported by Senior Citizen Public Housing Respondents 51

3.1.13B The Number of Health Conditions Which Interfere With the Activities of Daily Living Reported by Senior Citizen Public Housing Respondents by the Extent of Interference 52

3.1.14 The Number of Health Conditions Reported by Senior Citizen Public Housing Respondents by Age 53

3.1.15 The Type of Health Conditions Reported by Senior Citizen Public Housing Respondents and the Extent to Which it Interferes With Daily Activities 55

3.1.16 Senior Citizen Public Housing Respondents by Hospitalization 57

3.1.17 Frequency and Type of Contact With Children, Relatives and Friends Reported by Senior Citizen Public Housing Respondents 60

3.1.18 Number of Social Contacts Per Month Reported by Senior Citizen Public Housing Respondents 62

3.1.19 Number and Percentage of Senior Citizen Public Housing Respondents Reporting Children, Relatives and Friends on Whom They Can Depend by the Location of Contacts 63

3.2.1 Senior Citizen Public Housing Respondents: Their Difficulties With the Activities of Daily Living, Their Receipt of Help and Their Ability to Get By Without the Help Received 65

3.2.2 Number of Difficulties With Activities of Daily Living Reported by Senior Citizen Public Housing Respondents 66

3.2.3 Number of Difficulties With Activities of Daily Living Reported by Senior Citizen Public Housing Respondents by Age 68

3.2.4 Type of Difficulties With Activities of Daily Living Reported by Senior Citizen Public Housing Respondents 69

3.2.5 Type of Difficulties With Activity of Daily Living Reported by Senior Citizen Public Housing Respondents by Age 70

3.3.1 The Type of Assistance Senior Citizen Public Housing Respondents Received 74

3.3.2 Frequency of Assistance Received by Senior Citizen Public Housing Respondents Reporting Difficulties With Activities of Daily Living 76

3.3.3 Length of Time Help Was Received by Senior Citizen Public Housing Respondents Reporting Difficulties With the Activities of Daily Living 78

3.3.4 Duration of Help for Senior Citizen Public Housing Respondents Reporting Difficulties With the Activities of Daily Living 80

3.3.5 Persons Who Arranged Assistance for Senior Citizen Public Housing Respondents Reporting Difficulties With the Activities of Daily Living 82

3.3.6 Senior Citizen Housing Resondents by the Number of Community Services Used 84

3.3.7 Senior Citizen Public Housing Respondents by the Type of Community Services Used 85

3.3.8 Type of Community Services Used by Senior Citizen Respondents by Age 87

3.4.1 Senior Citizen Public Housing Respondents by the Percentage of Total Assistance Provided by Various Sources 89

3.4.2 Senior Citizen Public Housing Resondents, Activities of Daily Living by Source of Assistance 90

3.4.3 Summary of the Significant Relationships Between Type of Support Received by Senior Citizen Public Housing Respondents Reporting Difficulties With Activities of Daily Living and their Background Characteristics, Health Status and Frequency of Social Contact 93

3.4.4 No Support Reported by Senior Citizen Public Housing Respondents Reporting Difficulties With Activities of Daily Living by Age 95

3.4.5 Informal Support Received by Senior Citizen Public Housing Respondents Reporting Difficulties With Activities of Daily Living by Age 96

3.4.6 Formal Support Received by Senior Citizen Public Housing Respondents Reporting Difficulties With Activities of Daily Living by Age 97

3.4.7 No Support Reported by Senior Citizen Public Housing Respondents Reporting Difficulties With Activities of Daily Living by Household Status 98

3.4.8 Informal Support Received by Senior Citizen Public Housing Respondents Reporting Difficulties With Activities of Daily Living by Household Status 99

3.4.9 Formal Support Received by Senior Citizen Public Housing Respondents Reporting Difficulties With Activities of Daily Living by Household Status 100

3.4.10 No Support Reported by Senior Citizen Public Housing Respondents Reporting Difficulties With Activities of Daily Living by Education 102

3.4.11 Informal Support Reported by Senior Citizen Public Housing Respondents Reporting Difficulties With Activities of Daily Living by Education 103

3.4.12 Formal Support Reported by Senior Citizen Public Housing Respondents Reporting Difficulties With Activities of Daily Living by Education 104

3.4.13 No Support Reported by Senior Citizen Public Housing Respondents Reporting Difficulties With Activities of Daily Living by Birthplace and Year of Immigration 105

3.4.14 Informal Support Reported by Senior Citizen Public Housing Respondents Reporting Difficulties With Activities of Daily Living by Birthplace and Year of Immigration 106

3.4.15 Formal Support Reported by Senior Citizen Public Housing Respondents Reporting Difficulties With Activities of Daily Living by Birthplace and Year of Immigration 107

3.4.16 No Support Reported by Senior Citizen Public Housing Respondents Reporting Difficulties With Activities of Daily Living by Hospitalization 109

3.4.17 Informal Support Reported by Senior Citizen Public Housing Respondents Reporting Difficulties With Activities of Daily Living by Hospitalization 110

3.4.18 Formal Support Reported by Senior Citizen Public Housing Respondents Reporting Difficulties With Activities of Daily Living by Hospitalization 111

3.4.19 No Support Reported by Senior Citizen Public Housing Respondents Reporting Difficulties With Activities of Daily Living by Number of Social Contacts Per Month 113

3.4.20 Informal Support Reported by Senior Citizen Public Housing Respondents Reporting Difficulties With Activities of Daily Living by Number of Social Contacts Per Month 114

3.4.21 Formal Support Reported by Senior Citizen Public Housing Respondents Reporting Difficulties With Activities of Daily Living by Number of Social Contacts Per Month 115

3.5.1 The Senior Citizen Public Housing Respondents' Evaluation of the Extent to Which the Assistance They are Receiving With Activities of Daily Living is Enough Help and the Right Kind of Help 117

3.5.2 The Senior Citizen Public Housing Respondents' Evaluation of Their Ability to Get By Should They Not Have the Help They are Receiving 118

3.5.3 Patterns of Difficulties with Activities of Daily Living, Assistance Received, and Assistance Not Sought by Senior Citizen Public Housing Respondents 119

3.6.1 A Comparison of Senior Citizen Public Housing Respondents to Respondents from the USCO Survey: Age 123

3.6.2 A Comparison of the Total Household Monthly Income of Senior Citizen Public Housing Respondents to Respondents From the USCO Survey 124

3.6.3 A Comparison of Senior Citizen Public Housing Respondents to Respondents From the USCO Survey: Subjective Rating of Health by Age 127

3.6.4 A Comparison of Senior Citizen Public Housing Respondents to Respondents From the USCO Survey: The Extent to Which Health Problems Stand in the Way of Their Doing the Things They Want to Do 128

3.6.5 A Comparison of Senior Citizen Public Housing Respondents to Respondents from the USCO Survey: the Percentage Having Difficulties With Activities of Daily Living 131

3.6.6 A Comparison of Senior Citizen Public Housing Respondents to USCO Respondents: The Percentage of Total Assistance Provided 133

APPENDIX TABLES

A.1.1 Senior Citizen Public Housing Respondents by Help From Public Health Nurse or Other Nurse A4

A.1.2 Senior Citizen Public Housing Respondents by Help From Physical Therapist A7

A.1.3 Senior Citizen Public Housing Respondents by Help From Homemaking Services (Including Laundry) A11

A.1.4 Senior Citizen Public Housing Respondents By Help From Meal Services A14

A.1.5 Senior Citizen Public Housing Respondents By Help From Footcare Services A18

A.1.6 Senior Citizen Public Housing Respondents By Help From Vision Services A21

A.1.7 Senior Citizen Public Housing Respondents By Help From Dental Services A24

A.1.8 Senior Citizen Public Housing Respondents By Help From Day Hospitals A27

A.1.9 Senior Citizen Public Housing Respondents By Help From Nutrition Counselling A30

A.1.10 Senior Citizen Public Housing Respondents By Help From Friendly Visiting A33

A.1.11 Senior Citizen Public Housing Respondents By Help From Special Transportation A36

A.1.12 Senior Citizen Public Housing Respondents By Help From Housing Project Staff A40

A.1.13 Senior Citizen Public Housing Respondents By Help From Drop In Centres A43

A.2.1 Final Response Rate for the Support Service Providers Survey A45

A.2.2 Types of Respondents Grouped According to Job Title A46

A.2.3 Phase One Mailing List for Survey of Support Service Providers A47

A.2.4 Phase Two Mailing List for Survey of Support Service Providers A52

A.3.1 Survey of Service Use Patterns of Public Housing Tenants in Ontario Sampling Frame A59

A.3.2 Total Population and Population by Age Groups for each Municipality (1981 Census) A62

A.3.3 Median Private Annual Household Incomes for each Municipality (1981 Census) A63

A.3.4 Public Housing Senior Citizen Tenants by the Target and Actual Number of Interviews A67

A.3.5 Public Housing Seniors Fieldwork Report A69

A.3.6 Age Groupings, Household Status and Sex of Household Head in the Population of Public Housing Tenants in Ontario, in the Population of Tenants in the Eleven Communities Surveyed and the Sample of Tenant Respondents A72

A.3.7 Senior Citizen Public Housing Respondents, Survey Reliability As Reported by the Interviewers A74

A.4.1 Survey of Support Use Patterns of Public Housing Tenants in Ontario: Status Report on Tenant Questionnaire Fieldwork A77

A.4.2 Survey of Support Use Patterns of Public Housing Tenants in Ontario: Tenant Households Excluded from the Survey A78

A.4.3 Survey of Support Use Patterns of Public Housing Tenants in Ontario: In Depth Analysis of Refusals Seeking Refusals for Potential Medical Reasons A79

A.4.4 Survey of Support Use Patterns of Public Housing Tenants in Ontario: Summary of Tenant Refusals for Potential Medical Reasons A80

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The Patterns of Support survey involved the combined efforts of many people, and the authors of this report wish to acknowlege their help.

In particular we wish to thank members of the steering committee for their support, guidance and comments on earlier drafts of this report. They are George Hough (chair), Ministry of Housing, Sylvia Goldblatt, Canada Mortgage and Housing Corporation, Dorothy Singer, Arlene Hoffman and Margaret Farina from the Ministry of Community and Social Services, David Kennedy, Office of Senior Citizens' Affairs, Joan Leslie, Ontario Housing Corporation, Liz Lotto, Metropolitan Toronto Housing Company Ltd., and Esta Wall, Ministry of Health.

The development of a preliminary draft of the questionnaire under separate contract by Forma Consulting is also acknowledged.

Our gratitude extends to Jennifer Jackson, Consultant, and Anne Martin Matthews, Program in Gerontology, University of Guelph, for their comments on an earlier draft of the report.

Winnie Chan, from the Ministry of Housing provided assistance with tables and graphic construction and Carl Clutton and Selena Leung, Ministry of Housing provided access to and help with the Ministry of Housing computer system.

We also wish to thank Lynda Hayward, Beverley Parr, Margaret Knott, Meri Stojkovic-Oliver, Tovia Pearl, Jennifer Oliphant and Kamla Krill from Social Data Research Limited, whose combined research and clerical expertise was crucial to the success of this study.

We are grateful to the housing authority managers, project managers and community relations workers in each of the housing authorities sampled in the study for their assistance and co-operation.

Thanks are also extended to the many service providers who took the time to fill out the agency questionnaires.

In addition, we wish to acknowledge the excellent fieldwork done by a team of over twenty interviewers across the province.

Finally, we are grateful to the senior citizen public housing tenants who kindly agreed to participate in this study.

FOREWORD

This report was prepared for the Ministry of Housing under the direction of a Steering Committee.

The survey received financial support from the Ministry of Housing, Canada Mortgage and Housing Corporation, the Ministry of Community and Social Services and the Office of Senior Citizens' Affairs. Additional support was also provided by Ontario Housing Corporation, Metropolitan Toronto Housing Company Limited and the Ministry of Health.

This report does not necessarily reflect the views of the Ministry of Housing or any other agency represented on the steering committee. The responsibility for the collection of data and the accuracy of the analyses is that of the authors alone.

This report is intended to be a research report on the findings from the survey of senior citizen public housing tenants and the survey of agencies servicing the housing projects in which the tenants live.

No attempts have been made to "interpret the findings", nor to discuss the social policy implications of the findings. These important tasks are left to the social policy planners of related government ministries and other interested agencies or community services.

The survey of seniors in public housing is the first of its kind to be conducted among public housing tenants in Ontario. It indicates the extent to which senior citizen public housing respondents have difficulties with the activities of daily living and what kinds of support tenants use -- whether informal assistance from family, friends and neighbours and/or formal assistance from community services and agencies. The survey of agencies involves the opinions of the service providers regarding the needs of senior citizen public housing respondents.

It is our intent that the information gained from this survey will contribute to the development of appropriate policy in Ontario.

HIGHLIGHTS

The purpose of the study is to identify the extent to which senior citizens in public housing have difficulties with the activities of daily living and the kinds of supports they use -- informal assistance from family, friends and neighbours and/or formal services from community agencies.

The study involved two separate surveys: the first was a face-to-face interview with 479 senior citizen public housing tenants; the second was a mailed survey to 153 service providers and agencies. Both surveys afforded higher than average response rates -- 80.4% and 72.8% respectively.

In total, 11 communities were selected for study, including Belleville, Etobicoke, London, North York, Owen Sound, Peterborough, St. Catharines, Scarborough, Sudbury, Toronto, and York.

A. Agency Survey Findings

According to service providers

- Most of the seniors' housing projects are located in lower or middle income neighbourhoods with about one-third being situated in neighbourhoods that housed predominantly seniors.
- Most projects were accessible either by walking or public transit to facilities such as the corner store, restaurants, parks, drug stores, banks, shopping centres, churches and doctors' offices.

- Many seniors in public housing have no major problems, however, of those who do, the major concerns are isolation, inadequate incomes, poor physical health, not getting adequate meals, fear of crime, housekeeping problems and transportation problems.

- Almost all seniors in public housing have access to services such as the public health nurse, Meals on Wheels and homemaking, however, other services such as vision, hearing and dental clinics, laundry and other meal services are available in less than half of the housing projects.

- As many as one third to one half of the housing projects service providers did not know or had no opinion about the availability of services such as a security check, day care clinic, dental clinic, foot care, vision and hearing clinics, or other meal services.

- "Lack of information", "client unawareness", as well as the clients' "lack of recognition of their needs" and "lack of motivation" are the main reasons why seniors in public housing do not use the services they need.

- In about half of the housing projects, service providers reported that they never met with the housing project staff regarding their service delivery and in many instances they did not know what the role of the housing project staff was.

- A sizeable proportion of the respondents in the Agency survey said that they only hear about tenants' problems when a crisis arises and most felt that an on-site multi-service facility in public housing projects would aid or improve service delivery.

B. Tenant Survey Findings

- Most senior respondents were women, living alone, born in Canada or in the United Kingdom and whose principal source of income was government income security payments such as the old age security.

- The majority of senior respondents considered themselves to be in good or excellent health, although over one-half reported that health problems stood in the way of their doing the things they wanted to do.

- The majority of senior respondents had social contacts with children, other family, friends and neighbours.

- Almost eighty-five per cent of the senior tenants interviewed had at least one difficulty with the activities of daily living. The average number of difficulties with the activities of daily living reported by the respondent was 3.7.

- Over one-half of the respondents reported difficulties with activities like going up and down stairs, grocery shopping and heavy cleaning. Two-fifths of the respondents indicated they had difficulties cutting their toenails, getting around the community and doing light housework. One-fifth indicated difficulties doing laundry, bathing and preparing regular meals.

- About two-fifths of all respondents reported assistance with grocery shopping and heavy cleaning; one-half of all respondents had help getting around the community, doing light housework and banking/preparing bills. Less than one-fifth had help doing laundry, preparing meals and bathing.

- The majority of respondents with difficulties were receiving help from either formal or informal support sources. About 90 per cent of those having difficulties with grocery shopping and banking and preparing bills were receiving assistance. Approximately 75 per cent of those experiencing difficulties doing laundry and heavy cleaning had help. In terms of getting around the community, preparing meals and doing light housework, close to 70 per cent had assistance. About 40 per cent of respondents having difficulties bathing were receiving assistance.

- Two-thirds of all support received was provided by informal sources (children, other family, friends or neighbours) and one-third was provided by formal sources (community agencies, hired services, church, club or organization, etc.).

- Sources of support varied by the type of activity. Assistance with bathing, light housework and preparing regular meals came mainly from formal sources. Assistance with banking and preparing bills, getting around the community and doing laundry was provided largely by informal sources. Assistance with heavy cleaning came almost equally from both sources.

- The type of support received for those having difficulties varied significantly by a number of background characteristics including age, household status, education, birthplace and year of immigration, hospitalization and frequency of social contacts.

- Most respondents having difficulties reported receiving both "enough help" and "the right kind of help".

- A small group of respondents who experienced difficulties were not getting assistance. They included: 60 per cent of those who reported difficulties with bathing; about one-third of respondents who reported difficulty doing light housework and preparing regular meals; one-quarter of those who reported difficulties getting around the community, doing heavy cleaning and laundry; and 10 per cent of respondents who had difficulties grocery shopping and banking and preparing bills.

- Seventy per cent of the tenant respondents reported the use of at least one formal service within the past year which included housing project staff (including maintenance), public health nurses, drop in centres, homemaking services, vision services, footcare services, physiotherapists, meal services, nutrition counselling, dental services, special transportation, friendly visiting and day hospitals or clinics.

When the results from this study were compared to those of the 1981 "United Senior Citizens of Ontario" (USCO) study which surveyed the broad population of seniors in Ontario, a number of differences were found. Primarily:

- Seniors in the public housing sample were older, more likely to be female and to live alone than the USCO sample respondents.
- Seniors in the public housing sample had less education and a smaller monthly income.
- Seniors in the public housing sample were more likely to report difficulties with the activities of daily living, particularly in relation to bathing and preparing regular meals, banking and preparing bills, heavy cleaning and grocery shopping.
- Seniors in the public housing sample were more likely to use the assistance of formal services than respondents from the USCO study, particularly visiting nurses, homemakers, home care, meal services and friendly visiting.

CHAPTER I INTRODUCTION AND RESEARCH DESIGN

1.1 Introduction and Purpose of this Survey

The purpose of this study is to identify the kinds of support senior citizen public housing tenants use -- whether informal assistance from family, friends and neighbours and/or formal services from community agencies.

This study came into focus for two principal reasons. First, the substantial growth in numbers and percentages of senior citizens as well as the increase in life expectancy is having a profound effect on Ontario's demographic composition. The average age of the population is increasing and will continue to increase well into the next century (A New Agenda: Health and Social Service Strategies for Ontario's Seniors, 1986). Comprising approximately 12 per cent of the provincial population, the number of Ontario senior citizens is expected to increase dramatically until 2030 when the last of the baby boom reaches 65 years of age. At that time, Ontario's senior citizens are expected to represent approximately twenty-two per cent of the provincial population.

Second, there is mounting evidence to suggest that seniors prefer to remain in their own homes for as long as possible (Nusberg, 1984; Ontario, 1985a). Given this preference on the part of seniors, and their increase in numbers, the overall demand for support services is expected to increase.

These trends have implications for the future provision and management of assisted housing in Ontario. Tenants in public housing, like other senior citizens, have indicated a preference for remaining in their own homes as long as possible. Concern is expressed that today's public housing, which was built for self-reliant senior citizens, will become tomorrow's residence for the frail.

Accordingly, this study was undertaken to identify the kinds of supports senior citizen public housing tenants use. Supports may come from diverse sources, including both formal and informal sources. Research in the area of gerontology suggests that the majority of assistance to older persons is supplied by informal sources such as family members, friends and neighbours (Baltay, 1977; Shannas & Maddox, 1976; Shannas, 1979; Atchley, 1980; Branch and Jette, 1983). A minority of support is derived from formal sources such as Home Care, nursing services, meal services, footcare services, vision services, etc. Both the informal and formal sources of support assist elderly persons of declining abilities to remain in their own homes.

This study is intended to provide an indication of the living situation of senior citizen residents in public housing in Ontario. It concentrates specifically on the tenant groups experiencing difficulties with activities of daily living and the use (or lack of use) of support services.

One of the assumptions underpinning this study is the belief that, as individuals age, their requirements for assistance tend to increase. In 1981, the United Senior Citizens of Ontario (USCO), (an organization representing 250,000 persons) with the assistance of Health and Welfare Canada, the Ontario Ministries of Health, Community and Social Services, and the Office for Senior Citizens' Affairs, conducted a province-wide study of elderly persons residing outside of institutional settings. The principal objective of the study "was to gather baseline information on the living situations of older persons who reside outside of institutional settings" (Ontario, 1985a). Data from the survey of senior citizens in public housing will be compared to findings from the USCO study to determine similarities and differences in the provision of assistance.

1.2 Study Design and Methodology

The study design consisted of two surveys. The first was a face-to-face, structured interview with 479 senior citizen (i.e. 60 years of age or older) public housing tenants and the second was a mailed survey to agencies servicing the housing projects in which the sampled tenants lived.

The tenant survey included questions on the use of and requirement for support from both informal and formal sources; health; demographic and personal characteristics (i.e. age, sex, household status, education, income); and information on the respondent's social network. The survey of support service agencies asked respondents about aspects of tenants' neighbourhoods, facilities available to the tenants, perceived problems of tenants in the project, supports services available to tenants from community agencies, the services used by seniors in the housing projects compared to seniors in the community and the role of the agency in the project and the community (see Appendix 5 for copies of the questionnaire).

The sampling method for the tenant survey employed a three stage probability process: the selection of municipalities in which to sample, the selection of housing projects to be sampled within the municipalities, and the selection of senior tenants within the selected housing projects. The sampling procedure is discussed in more detail in Appendix 3. The municipalities selected were Belleville, London, Metropolitan Toronto, Owen

Sound, Peterborough, St. Catharines and Sudbury. The sample was drawn from the data files of Ontario Housing Corporation (OHC). In Metropolitan Toronto, OHC is only one of many suppliers of public housing. As such, the patterns of support for seniors in Toronto may not be an accurate reflection of the situation of all seniors in public housing in Metropolitan Toronto.

The response rate on the tenant survey was 80.4 per cent, with 15.8 per cent refusing to be interviewed and 3.9 per cent contacted but not interviewed. (For more detailed information, see Appendix 3, Table A.3.5).

The various support service agencies were asked to complete a questionnaire for each of the housing projects in their municipality and/or jurisdiction and 72.8 per cent of the service providers responded (for more details on the methodology see Chapter 2 and Appendix 2).

CHAPTER 2 AGENCY SURVEY FINDINGS

2.0 Introduction

This section of the report presents the findings from the survey of support service providers from each of the six selected municipalities: Belleville, London, Metropolitan Toronto, Owen Sound, Peterborough, St. Catharines and Sudbury.

A number of objectives guided the formation of this study. They are:

1. To describe the neighbourhoods where housing projects are located.
2. To describe the service providers' perceptions of the tenants' problems.
3. To describe the service providers' perceptions of the services available to the tenants.
4. To describe why some tenants do not use the available services.
5. To describe the service providers' perceptions of their role in the housing projects.

2.1 Methodology

The survey was conducted through the mail and respondents were asked to complete a separate questionnaire relating to each of the housing projects sampled in their municipality or jurisdiction. The questionnaire addressed areas such as: neighbourhood location; quality of life and access; needs of people in the project; support services available to tenants from community agencies; and the role of the respondent's agency or service in the project and the area. (See Appendix 5 for a copy of the questionnaire).

An exhaustive list of agencies and organizations (see Appendix 2) was compiled from various community service directories. Included in this list were the community relations workers associated with the housing projects from which the tenants were sampled.

The survey was carried out in two phases. In the first phase, service providers from the compiled list were sent questionnaires[1]. In addition to answering questions about the projects and senior citizen tenants, respondents were asked to provide a list of those agencies, organizations and individuals which they felt were the main service providers to seniors in the sample housing projects. All of the names provided (see Appendix 2) were sent questionnaires in phase two.

---

[1] In the case of Metro Toronto where many services are decentralized, only community relations workers were initially surveyed.

In both phases, 173 service providers were contacted and a total of 604 questionnaires (one for each sampled housing project in their jurisdiction) was mailed. Almost three-quarters (72.8%) of the service providers responded, either by returning one or more completed questionnaires or by sending a letter explaining their role with the housing projects.

A total of 224 (37.1%) questionnaires was completed (see Appendix 2 for a detailed breakdown of response rates by municipality). Of this total, 153 questionnaires contained information about housing projects for seniors. About one-third of the questionnaires received were completed by Community Relations Workers (34.8%), followed by Public Health Nurses (17.4%). Other respondents included agency directors, program supervisors and co-ordinators and income maintenance officers (see Appendix 2, Table A.2.1 for a detailed description of the response pattern by service providers).

The number of services and the types of agencies varied by municipality. Consequently, the number and type of responses varied also. One should be cautioned that the results in this section are directly related to the existence in any given community of the various services. Readers should also note that the findings in this section are based on the professional opinions of the service providers who responded to the survey, and are not necessarily representative of the service providers in the municipalities as a whole.

Since each respondent may have returned one or more completed questionnaires, the numbers presented in the tables in this chapter reflect the number of questionnaires or responses received and not the number of service providers who responded to the survey.

2.2 A Description of the Neighbourhood Where Housing Projects for Seniors are Located

The service providers were asked a number of questions concerning the neighbourhood in which each housing project was located. Although variations were found by municipality, housing projects were located most frequently in "older residential areas" (30.7%) (see Table 2.2.1). A "residential area with mainly single family homes" was almost as common (28.1%). Close to one-fifth of the housing projects were in "commercial areas" (19.6%) or "residential areas that have mainly townhouses or apartments" (18.3%). Thus, the majority (77.1%) of housing projects serviced by the responding agencies were situated in residential areas.

About one-third (32.0%) of the seniors' housing projects were located in neighbourhoods with mostly "older retired people" (see Table 2.2.2). Most of the remaining senior housing projects were in areas housing mostly "families with young children" (17.7%), "single parent families" (15.0%), or "families with teenagers" (13.1%). A few projects were in neighbourhoods with mainly ethnic, single or transient people.

When questioned about the socio-economic profile of the surrounding areas, service providers felt that the housing projects were located in either a "combination of middle to low income" neighbourhoods (60.0%) or "low income" areas (28.5%) (see Table 2.2.3). Variations did exist by municipality. In Belleville, St. Catharines and Owen Sound, for example,

TABLE 2.2.1

Support Service Providers' Perceptions of the Type of Neighbourhood Surrounding the Seniors' Housing Project
Percent of Respondents by Predominant Type of Neighbourhood

Predominant Type of Neighbourhood	(N)	%
Primarily:		
Older residential area	(47)	30.7
Residential area with mainly single family homes	(43)	28.1
Commercial area	(30)	19.6
Residential area that is mainly apartments or townhouses	(28)	18.3
Semi-industrial area	(4)	2.6
Other	(1)	0.6
Total	(153)	100.0

(Source, Question Q1)

TABLE 2.2.2

Support Service Providers' Perceptions of the type of Residents in the Surrounding Neighbourhood
Percent of Respondents by Predominant type of Resident

Predominant Type of Neighbourhood Resident	(N)	%
Mostly:		
Older retired people	(49)	32.0
Families with young children	(27)	17.7
Single parent families	(23)	15.0
Families with teenagers	(20)	13.1
Ethnic people	(8)	5.2
Single people	(4)	2.6
Transient people	(4)	2.6
Other types of people	(3)	2.0
Total	(153)	100.0

(Source: Question Q2)

TABLE 2.2.3

Support Service Providers' Perceptions of the Socio-Economic Level of Households
In the Seniors' Project Neighbourhood By Municipality

Socio-Economic Levels:	Total		Municipalities													
			Belleville		London		Metro Toronto		Owen Sound		Peterborough		St. Catharines		Sudbury	
	(N)	%	(N)	%	(N)	%	(N)	%	(N)	%	(N)	%	(N)	%	(N)	%
Combination of middle and low incomes	(77)	60.0	(1)	14.3	(24)	55.8	(26)	59.1	(6)	54.6	(11)	61.1	(5)	41.7	(4)	25.0
Mostly low income	(43)	28.5	(1)	14.3	(14)	32.6	(14)	31.8	(1)	9.1	(3)	16.7	(0)	0.0	(10)	62.5
Mostly middle income	(31)	20.5	(5)	71.4	(5)	11.6	(4)	9.1	(4)	36.4	(4)	22.2	(7)	58.3	(2)	12.5

respondents indicated that the projects were located in middle income neighbourhoods. Respondents from Sudbury, however, reported, more so than others, that the seniors' projects were located in "mostly low income" neighbourhoods.

The service providers were asked to rate a variety of aspects of the neighbourhood surrounding the housing project on a scale ranging from "excellent", "very good", "good", "fair" to "poor" (see Table 2.2.4). With the exception of public transit, respondents as a whole were not inclined to rate the neighbourhood characteristics highly (either "excellent" or "very good"). Aspects of safety such as "safety from crime against property", "safe to go out at night" and "safety from violence against people" were rated highly by less than twenty per cent of the respondents, although, in about half (50.3%) of the projects, respondents rated the neighbourhood as being "safe to go out during the day" as "excellent" or "very good".

Respondents rated some characteristics of the neighbourhood highly for only about one-quarter of the housing projects, namely "condition of housing" (25.5%), "quality of air" (25.5%), "amount of noise from traffic, etc." (22.2%), "parks and playgrounds" (23.5%), while others such as "local shopping nearby" was rated as "excellent" or "very good" by 40.5 per cent of respondents and "church or synagogue" by 31.4 per cent.

There are some municipality differences with respect to these ratings. In Sudbury, on the one hand, none of the

TABLE 2.2.4

Support Service Providers' Rating of Selected Neighbourhood Neighbourhood Attributes
Percent of Respondents Indicating Very Good or Excellent By Municipality

Per Cent of Agencies Responding either Very Good or Excellent for:	Total		Belleville		London		Metro Toronto		Municipalities Owen Sound		Peterborough		St. Catharines		Sudbury	
	(N)	%	(N)	%	(N)	%	(N)	%	(N)	%	(N)	%	(N)	%	(N)	%
Safety from crime against property	(23)	15.0	(3)	37.5	(3)	7.0	(2)	4.7	(3)	27.3	(5)	27.8	(4)	33.3	(3)	18.8
Safe to go out at night	(27)	17.6	(2)	25.0	(4)	9.1	(7)	16.3	(3)	27.3	(5)	27.8	(6)	50.0	(0)	0.0
Safety from violence against people	(28)	18.3	(3)	42.8	(3)	6.8	(8)	18.2	(4)	36.4	(5)	27.8	(5)	41.7	(0)	0.0
Recreation and other facilities	(28)	18.3	(2)	25.0	(4)	9.5	(16)	36.4	(0)	0.0	(1)	5.6	(3)	27.3	(2)	12.5
Community service	(30)	19.6	(1)	12.5	(3)	6.8	(15)	34.1	(2)	20.0	(2)	11.8	(5)	41.7	(2)	12.5
Safe for children	(34)	22.2	(1)	16.7	(6)	18.2	(15)	34.1	(4)	40.0	(4)	25.0	(4)	40.0	(0)	0.0
Amount of noise from traffic, etc.	(34)	22.2	(3)	37.5	(8)	18.2	(8)	18.6	(4)	36.4	(5)	27.8	(3)	25.0	(3)	18.8
Parks and playgrounds nearby	(36)	23.5	(1)	14.3	(4)	9.3	(17)	38.6	(2)	18.2	(5)	27.8	(6)	50.0	(1)	6.3
Quality of air	(39)	25.5	(4)	50.0	(9)	20.5	(8)	18.2	(6)	54.5	(6)	35.3	(6)	50.0	(0)	0.0
Condition of housing	(39)	25.5	(4)	50.0	(4)	9.1	(11)	25.0	(5)	45.5	(5)	27.8	(6)	50.0	(4)	25.0
Church or synagogue	(48)	31.4	(2)	28.6	(11)	25.6	(13)	29.5	(4)	36.4	(9)	50.0	(4)	36.4	(5)	31.3
Schools	(49)	32.0	(1)	16.7	(4)	11.8	(27)	61.4	(3)	27.3	(6)	35.3	(3)	33.3	(5)	31.3
Local shopping nearby	(62)	40.5	(2)	25.0	(18)	40.9	(22)	47.7	(1)	9.0	(7)	38.9	(5)	41.7	(8)	50.0
Safe to go out during day	(77)	50.3	(6)	75.0	(19)	44.2	(24)	54.5	(7)	63.6	(11)	61.1	(7)	58.3	(3)	18.8
Public transit	(89)	58.2	(3)	42.9	(25)	56.8	(27)	61.4	(6)	54.5	(12)	66.7	(6)	50.0	(10)	61.4

(Source: Question Q4)

respondents gave high ratings to aspects such as "quality of air", "safe to go out at night", "safe for children", and "safety from violence against people". St. Catharines, on the other hand, seems to fare better than the other municipalities on most items, particularly with respect to amenities or characteristics such as "parks and playgrounds", "churches or synagogues", "the quality of the air", "property safe from crime", "safe to go out at night", "safe for children", "community services" and "safe from violence".

Accessibility to facilities in the neighbourhood was addressed by a number of questions. According to the service providers, almost all projects (92.2%, N = 141) were accessible to public transit, and in almost all cases (93.5%, N = 143) transit service was available on a frequent basis. About six per cent (5.9%, N = 9) of the service providers' responses indicated that it was fairly or very difficult for tenants to get around the neighbourhood.

Responses to questions of accessibility to specific facilities are given in Table 2.2.5. For the most part, the seniors' housing projects were perceived to be within either easy walking or easy transit distance of important facilities. However, only the corner store (79.1%) was within easy walking distance for a large majority of tenants. About half of the projects were within easy walking distance of a restaurant (54.9%) for example, or a park (52.3%), the drug store (51.0%), or a bank (51.0%). Just over forty per cent were within easy

TABLE 2.2.5

Support Service Providers' Perception of the Location of Facilities in the Neighbourhood Surrounding the Seniors Housing Project (Per Cent of Responses Indicating Within Easy Walking and Transit Distance)

Neighbourhood Facilities	Within Easy Walking Distance		Within Easy Transit Distance	
	(N)	%	(N)	%
Corner Store	(121)	79.1	(16)	10.5
Restaurant/Coffee Shop	(84)	54.9	(53)	34.6
Parks	(80)	52.3	(47)	30.7
Drug Store	(78)	51.0	(59)	38.6
Bank	(78)	51.0	(58)	37.9
Doctor's Office	(68)	44.4	(57)	37.3
Tavern/Bar	(67)	43.8	(59)	38.6
Shopping Centre	(63)	41.2	(69)	45.1
Church/Synagogue	(64)	41.8	(60)	39.2
Post Office	(55)	36.0	(67)	43.8
Baseball Parks, Football, Hockey, etc.	(49)	32.0	(45)	29.4
Pools	(38)	24.8	(56)	36.6
Medical Clinics	(38)	24.8	(85)	55.6
Senior Activities - Bingo Halls, etc.	(33)	21.6	(83)	54.3
Senior Citizen Centre	(32)	20.9	(70)	45.8
Library	(29)	19.0	(90)	58.8
Summer Only Programs	(29)	19.0	(43)	28.1
Commercial, Recreation Facilities	(22)	14.4	(106)	69.3
Community Centres	(17)	11.1	(98)	64.1
Arenas	(16)	10.5	(79)	51.6
Hospital Emergency	(13)	8.5	(107)	69.9

(Source: Question Q6)

walking distance of a shopping centre (41.2%), a church (41.8%) or a doctor's office (44.4%).

Accessibility did vary somewhat by community. For example, compared to all projects, those located in Metro Toronto were more likely to be within easy walking distance to a number of facilities such as parks, playgrounds, sports fields, pools, senior citizen centres, libraries, the corner store, shopping, the drug store, doctor's office, medical clinics, a bank, a post office and a restaurant.

2.3 Service Providers' Perceptions of Tenant Problems

The service providers were asked to report the seriousness of a number of tenant problems that might be experienced by the senior citizen public housing respondents. These problems are listed in Table 2.3.1, as well as the percentage of responses given by agencies who rated each specific problem as "very" or "fairly serious". According to service providers, the most serious problem for the senior tenants as a whole, appeared to be "being isolated" (35.9%), followed by "inadequate incomes" (27.5%) "poor physical health" (23.5%), "getting adequate meals" (15.0%), "fear of crime" (14.4%), "housekeeping problems" (13.7%) and "transportation problems" (11.8%). The remaining potential problems - "inability to manage money", "abuse of alcohol or drugs", or "over use of medical facilities" were mentioned as serious in less than ten per cent of the cases. "Being isolated" appeared to be rated as "very" or "fairly serious" most frequently in almost all of the municipalities, including Belleville (25.0%, N = 2), London (30.2%, N = 13), Metro Toronto (54.8%, N = 23), Owen Sound (50.0%, N = 6), and Sudbury (35.3%, N = 6). The exceptions were found in Peterborough, where "poor physical health" was rated as more serious (22.2%, N = 4) and St. Catharines, where "inadequate incomes" was the problem rated most often as "very" or "fairly serious" (23.1%, N = 3).

Table 2.3.1

Support Service Providers' Rating of Selected Tenant Problems
Percent of Respondents Indicating Very Serious or Serious Tenant Problems by Municipality

Problem			Municipalities													
	Total		Belleville		London		Metro Toronto		Owen Sound		Peterborough		St. Catharines		Sudbury	
	(N)	%	(N)	%	(N)	%	(N)	%	(N)	%	(N)	%	(N)	%	(N)	%
Being isolated	(55)	35.9	(2)	25.0	(13)	30.2	(23)	54.8	(6)	50.0	(3)	16.7	(2)	15.4	(6)	35.3
Inadequate incomes	(42)	27.5	(1)	12.5	(13)	30.2	(18)	42.9	(0)	0.0	(1)	5.6	(3)	23.1	(6)	35.3
Poor physical health	(36)	23.5	(1)	12.5	(8)	18.6	(16)	38.1	(4)	33.3	(4)	22.2	(0)	0.0	(3)	17.6
Getting adequate meals	(23)	15.0	(0)	0.0	(5)	11.6	(12)	28.6	(2)	16.7	(1)	5.6	(0)	0.0	(3)	17.6
Fear of crime	(22)	14.4	(0)	0.0	(4)	9.3	(14)	33.3	(0)	0.0	(0)	0.0	(0)	0.0	(4)	23.5
Housingkeeping	(21)	13.7	(0)	0.0	(5)	11.6	(8)	19.0	(2)	16.7	(1)	5.6	(1)	7.7	(4)	23.5
Transportation problems	(18)	11.8	(0)	0.0	(4)	9.3	(10)	23.8	(1)	8.3	(1)	5.6	(0)	0.0	(2)	11.8
Abuse of alcohol	(13)	8.5	(0)	0.0	(7)	16.3	(6)	14.3	(0)	0.0	(0)	0.0	(0)	0.0	(0)	0.0
Inability to manage money	(9)	5.9	(0)	0.0	(1)	2.3	(6)	14.3	(0)	0.0	(0)	0.0	(2)	15.4	(0)	0.0
Abuse of drugs	(7)	4.6	(0)	0.0	(3)	7.0	(2)	4.8	(2)	16.7	(0)	0.0	(0)	0.0	(0)	0.0
Over use of medical facilities	(4)	2.6	(0)	0.0	(0)	0.0	(3)	7.1	(1)	8.3	(0)	0.0	(0)	0.0	(0)	0.0

Source: Question Q8

2.4 Support Services Available to Senior Tenants from Community Agencies

One of the key issues addressed in the survey was the availability of support services to public housing tenants. The service providers were asked to evaluate a list of 25 services in terms of their availability to senior tenants (see Table 2.4.1). One way of assessing the results in this table is to look first at the proportion of responses given by agencies who say that the particular service is available to senior tenants. This proportion varies considerably among the services, however, there was a general consensus that almost all tenants have access to a "public health nurse" (95.4%), "Meals on Wheels" (91.5%), and "homemaking services" (89.5%). Most of the other services were available to a majority of tenants, however, there were a few services that, according to the respondents, were available to less than half of the seniors in the sample including the "day care clinic" (49.0%), "dental clinic" (47.7%), "laundry services" (43.1%), and "other meal services" (22.9%).

Table 2.4.1 can also be seen as a reflection of the differences in awareness of the respondents about the existence of services other than the one they offer. The proportion of respondents who say that they "don't know" or didn't respond when asked about a particular service ranged from less than five per cent (4.6%) for the "public health nurse" to almost fifty per cent (49.7%) for "other meal services". In about one-quarter to one-third of the housing projects, respondents didn't know or didn't have an opinion about the availability of other services

TABLE 2.4.1

Support Service Providers' Perceptions of Supports Available to Senior Tenants

Types of Support Services	Available		Not Available		Don't Know/ No Answer	
	(N)	%	(N)	%	(N)	%
Public health nurse	(146)	95.4	(0)	0.0	(7)	4.6
Meals on Wheels	(140)	91.5	(1)	0.7	(12)	7.8
Homemaking services	(137)	89.5	(1)	0.7	(16)	10.5
Special transportation services	(135)	88.2	(1)	0.7	(17)	11.1
Community information services	(123)	80.4	(5)	3.3	(25)	16.3
Mental health services	(121)	79.1	(3)	2.0	(29)	19.0
Family counselling services	(119)	77.8	(6)	3.9	(28)	18.3
Nutrition counselling	(117)	76.5	(3)	2.0	(33)	21.6
*Housing project staff	(114)	74.5	(4)	2.6	(35)	22.9
Drug/alcohol counselling	(112)	73.2	(4)	2.6	(37)	24.2
Friendly visiting	(111)	72.5	(11)	7.2	(31)	20.3
Physio therapist	(108)	70.6	(2)	1.3	(43)	28.1
Recreational community care	(107)	69.9	(19)	12.4	(27)	17.6
Legal services	(106)	69.3	(8)	5.2	(39)	25.5
Occupational therapist	(105)	68.6	(4)	2.6	(44)	28.8
Budget counselling	(94)	61.4	(15)	9.8	(44)	28.8
Foot care clinic	(85)	55.5	(21)	13.7	(47)	30.7
Day hospital	(79)	51.6	(29)	19.0	(45)	29.4
Security check	(78)	51.0	(26)	17.0	(49)	32.0
Vision clinic	(76)	49.7	(31)	20.3	(46)	30.1
Hearing clinic	(76)	49.7	(31)	20.3	(46)	30.1
Day care clinic	(75)	49.0	(29)	19.0	(49)	32.0
Dental clinic	(73)	47.7	(30)	19.6	(50)	32.7
Laundry services	(66)	43.1	(32)	20.9	(55)	35.9
Other meal services	(35)	22.9	(42)	27.5	(76)	49.7

* includes maintenance staff

(Source: Question Q14a)

to senior housing tenants in their community.

Service providers were offered a list of reasons why some public housing tenants do not use the service they may need. Of this list, most respondents agreed that "lack of information" and "lack of recognition of needs" on the part of the tenants themselves, were the main factors.

2.5 The Role of Agencies

The questionnaire to service providers included a number of items pertaining to their role in public housing, their opinions about the role of the public housing staff, and some of the problems that service providers face. Many of these questions were open-ended. A brief overview of some of the responses is given here.

Respondents were asked whether or not the housing project staff help senior tenants decide on their needs for services. In almost half of the cases, the answer was "yes" (45.4%, N = 64). Another forty per cent (43.3%, N = 61) said "they didn't know" and the remaining eleven per cent of the responses indicated (11.4%, N = 16) "no".

A subsequent question was asked concerning how much the housing project staff help tenants obtain the available services. Over fifteen per cent (17.5%, N = 25) of the responses reflected a feeling by the agency respondents that project staff helped "a great deal", while the same number said "a fair amount" (17.5%, N = 25) or "only a little" (21.0%, N = 30), and less than six per cent (5.6%, N = 8) indicated "not at all". The most frequently given response by the respondents was that they "didn't know" (38.5%, N = 55).

Another question to agencies concerning the role of the housing project staff was whether or not the staff of the housing project could do more to help tenants in seniors' housing projects get the service they need. In almost half (46.4%, N = 90) of the housing projects, the respondents felt that they could, in another nine per cent (9.2%, N = 18) they thought obtaining services was the individual tenant's responsibility, and in about five per cent of the projects (5.7%, N = 11), the respondents were of the opinion that obtaining services was the agencies' responsibility. In more than one-quarter (27.6%, N = 37) of the senior housing projects, respondents felt that the housing project staff provided sufficient help, and in about ten per cent (10.5%, N = 14), they didn't know what the role of housing project staff should be.

Agencies were of the opinion that family and friends should help more in only about four per cent (3.7%, N = 5) of the projects. Over half felt family (56.9%, N = 87) and neighbours (50.3%, N = 77) were providing a great deal or at least a fair amount of help to seniors with problems and needs.

A number of questions in the survey concerned some of the problems that service providers face in their work with senior tenants in public housing. When respondents were asked whether they felt they were able to learn about tenant problems soon enough to take the appropriate action, a sizable proportion (42.9%, N = 57) of the responses reflected the opinion by agencies that they only hear about problems when a crisis arises. In about one-quarter (24.8%, N = 33) of the projects, respondents claimed that they found out about such problems quite soon, and in just under one-third (30.1%, N = 40) of the projects, respondents reported only sometimes finding out about problems right away.

Respondents felt that an on-site multi-service facility in public housing projects would aid or improve service delivery in most (65.0%, N = 91) of the senior projects, although in almost one-quarter (24.3%, N = 34) of the cases, respondents said they didn't know if this type of facility would be advantageous. When asked whether or not there was a neighbourhood planning mechanism available in the area where the housing project was located, over one-half (55.0%, N = 78) of the respondents didn't know. Of those who said a planning mechanism did exist (24.1%, N = 34), half said it was somewhat or very effective (50.0%, N = 18).

The final question that dealt with problems faced by service providers asked how frequently a number of specifically listed problems presented major obstacles in their work or the work of their agency. The list of problems and the overall responses given are presented in Table 2.5.1. The two problems that occurred most often, according to the agencies, were "client unawareness " (36.1% reporting that this occurs often), and "lack of client motivation" (33.6%). Closely following these problems was "lack of client confidence" (27.9%).

Table 2.5.2 presents the per cent of agency responses reporting that these problems occur "often", broken down by municipality. "Client unawareness", for example, was not

TABLE 2.5.1

The Frequency With Which Respondents Encountered Obstacles to Support Delivery

Obstacles to Support Delivery	Often (N)	Often %	Sometimes (N)	Sometimes %	Rarely (N)	Rarely %	Never (N)	Never %
Client unawareness	(48)	36.1	(69)	51.9	(12)	9.0	(3)	2.3
Lack of client motivation	(44)	33.6	(75)	57.3	(9)	6.9	(2)	1.5
Lack of client confidence	(38)	27.9	(69)	50.7	(22)	16.2	(6)	4.4
Long waiting lists for referrals	(21)	16.2	(59)	45.4	(41)	31.5	(8)	6.2
Clients see Services as undesirable	(18)	14.1	(56)	43.8	(41)	32.0	(12)	9.4
Lack of co-ordination between community services	(18)	13.9	(59)	45.4	(43)	33.1	(8)	6.2
Lack of clarity of roles	(17)	13.1	(42)	32.3	(59)	45.4	(11)	8.5
Clients see services as admission of helplessness	(17)	12.9	(77)	58.3	(28)	21.2	(9)	6.8
Stigma attached	(15)	9.8	(79)	51.6	(31)	20.3	(6)	3.9
Inadequacies in the assessment process	(7)	5.5	(63)	49.2	(51)	39.8	(6)	4.7

(Source: Question Q31)

TABLE 2.5.2

Support Service Providers' Perception of Obstacles to the Delivery of Supports
Respondents Reporting Obstacles Encountered Often by Municipallity

Problem	Total		Belleville		London		Metro Toronto		Municipalities Owen Sound		Peterborough		St. Catharines		Sudbury	
	(N)	%	(N)	%	(N)	%	(N)	%	(N)	%	(N)	%	(N)	%	(N)	%
Client unawareness	(48)	36.1	(1)	20.0	(17)	42.5	(19)	45.2	(1)	11.1	(5)	35.7	(0)	0.0	(5)	33.3
Lack of client motivation	(44)	33.6	(0)	0.0	(10)	27.8	(27)	62.8	(1)	11.1	(1)	7.1	(0)	0.0	(5)	33.3
Lack of client confidence	(38)	27.9	(0)	0.0	(21)	51.2	(12)	27.9	(2)	22.2	(1)	7.1	(0)	0.0	(2)	13.3
Long waiting Lists for referrals	(21)	16.2	(2)	40.0	(7)	19.4	(4)	9.3	(2)	22.2	(1)	7.1	(4)	44.4	(1)	7.1
Clients see services as undesirable	(18)	14.1	(0)	0.0	(6)	17.7	(10)	23.8	(0)	0.0	(0)	0.0	(0)	0.0	(2)	13.3
Lack of co-ordination between community services	(18)	13.9	(2)	40.0	(5)	14.3	(7)	16.3	(0)	0.0	(1)	7.1	(2)	22.2	(1)	6.7
Lack of clarity of roles	(17)	13.1	(0)	0.0	(7)	19.4	(4)	9.5	(0)	0.0	(1)	7.1	(2)	22.2	(3)	20.0
Clients see services as admission of helplessness	(17)	12.9	(1)	20.0	(4)	10.8	(8)	18.6	(1)	11.1	(0)	0.0	(1)	11.1	(2)	13.3
Stigma attached	(15)	9.8	(1)	12.5	(3)	6.8	(9)	20.5	(0)	0.0	(0)	0.0	(1)	8.3	(1)	6.3
Inadequacies in the assessment process	(7)	5.5	(0)	0.0	(2)	5.6	(4)	10.0	(0)	0.0	(0)	0.0	(1)	11.1	(0)	0.0

* Inconsistency in some per cents due to different number of municipality responses to each problem.

(Source: Question Q31)

considered a problem according to respondents in St. Catharines (0.0%, N = 0), or in the other smaller municipalities (Owen Sound, 11.1%, N = 1; Belleville, 20.0%, N = 1; Peterborough, 35.7%, N = 5; and Sudbury, 33.3%, N = 5). However, it was perceived as a problem more often in London (45.2%, N = 17) and Metro Toronto (45.2%, N = 19). In fact, most of the problems listed were perceived by agencies as ones occurring more often as obstacles in London and Metro Toronto than in the other municipalities.

The final few questions in the survey concerned the specific roles that the various agencies had in the seniors' housing projects and the surrounding community. Respondents were asked, how often they were in the project for purposes of service delivery. Their responses varied by the type of service offered. For the purpose of this analysis the results are discussed for the agencies overall. More than half (56.9%) of the projects were visited by service providers at least once a week, if not more.

In half of the projects (50.7%), the service providers indicated they "never" met with housing project staff regarding their service delivery, and less than twenty per cent (17.1%) of the time they met with staff "less than once a month". When asked how often they engage in case conferring with other service providers, most responses indicated "less than once a month" or "never" (58.4%).

In the majority (59.3%) of housing projects, service providers indicated that their agency did not provide more intense service in that particular housing project than in the community as a whole. And in most (70.8%) of the projects, there were no other agencies in the area providing the same sort of services.

As a final question, service providers were asked to anticipate any significant changes in the degrees of independence among the senior residents in the projects over the next five years. More than half (55.5%) of the responses reflected the opinion by respondents that things would remain the same, almost thirty per cent (29.7%) expected residents to become less independent, and in only thirteen per cent (13.3%) of the projects did service providers feel that residents would become more independent.

CHAPTER 3 TENANT SURVEY FINDINGS

3.0 Introduction

This chapter of the report presents the findings for the survey of senior citizen public housing tenants. A number of objectives guided the formation of the study. They were:

1. To describe senior citizen public housing tenants with respect to their background characteristics, health status and social networks.
2. To describe the difficulties with the activities of daily living reported by senior citizen public housing tenants.
3. To describe the type of, frequency and arrangement for assistance received by senior citizen public housing tenants who are experiencing difficulties with the activities of daily living.
4. To describe the sources of assistance used by public housing tenants experiencing difficulties with the activities of daily living and the differences in the sources of assistance used.
5. To describe the extent to which senior citizen public housing tenants who are experiencing difficulties with the activities of daily living are receiving the help they indicate they need.
6. To compare the senior citizen public housing tenants with the respondents from the United Senior Citizens of Ontario.

Chapter 3 reports the findings, in turn, for each of these objectives.

3.1 Background Characteristics, Health Status and Social Networks

This section describes the senior citizen public housing respondents in terms of selected demographic and social-background characteristics, aspects of their health status, and their social networks.

3.1.A Background Characteristics

i) Demographic Characteristics

The senior tenants ranged in age from 60 to 97. Table 3.1.1 shows that the vast majority were in the 65 - 85 age group (76.5%), and only three per cent (3.1%) were 90 years of age or older. A comparison of the ages of the respondents in this survey to the ages of all senior citizen public housing tenants in Ontario indicates that the average age of the respondents in the sample was slightly older than for all senior citizen tenants. About three-quarters (78.5%) of the respondents were women. Overall, about ninety per cent (89.8%) of the seniors lived alone; nine per cent (8.8%) resided with a spouse or partner; and the remaining one per cent (1.4%) lived with a child or other relative.

Table 3.1.2 indicates that over half (52.7%) of the seniors had a grade eight education or less; another twenty per cent (19.8%) completed grades 9 or 10; nineteen per cent completed grades 11, 12 or 13; and seven per cent (7.1%) had some education beyond the high school level. A comparison of this data to the 1981 Census data on education of elderly persons (65+) in Ontario shows that the educational level of the seniors in the public housing sample was slightly lower than elderly persons in Ontario generally (see Appendix 4, Table A.4.1).

Close to ninety per cent (89.1%) of the respondents used English all, or most of the time; five per cent (4.8%) used

TABLE 3.1.1

Senior Citizen Public Housing Respondents by Age*

Age Ranges	Percentages by	
	Range	Group
60-64	12.1	
65-69	14.6	37.4
70-74	22.8	
75-79	19.9	39.1
80-84	19.2	
85-89	7.7	10.8
90+	3.1	
Refusal	0.6	

Total N = 479

* Senior Citizen Public Housing Respondents are defined as Public housing tenants sixty years of age or more.

(Source: Question 2.10)

TABLE 3.1.2

Senior Citizen Public Housing Respondents by Education

Years of Education Completed	Percentage
Grade 6 or Less	18.0
Grades 7 or 8	34.7
Grades 9 or 10	19.8
Grades 11, 12 or 13	18.6
Some Post-Secondary	7.1
Other, Refusal, Don't Know	1.9

Total N = 479

(Source Question 7.3)

French; and another six per cent (6.1%) spoke a language other than English or French.

About two-thirds (67.9%) of the respondents were born in Canada, while the remainder were born in the United Kingdom (16.3%) or other countries (15.8%). (See Table 3.1.3). Of those foreign born, over 80 per cent (80.4%, N = 153) immigrated to Canada before 1960.

A comparison of the data from the 1981 Census data on birthplace of elderly persons (65+) in Ontario to data generated from the sample of public housing seniors (65+) shows that slightly more of the public housing seniors were either born in Canada (65.8% vs 62.8%) or the United Kingdom (17.0% vs 14.6%) than elderly persons, as a whole, in Ontario. These findings suggest that elderly persons born in countries outside Canada, other than the United Kingdom, are underrepresented in public housing.

ii) Income

Table 3.1.4 indicates that the seniors' household monthly income varied from less than $500 per month (15.3%) to over $1000 per month (4.6%), with almost sixty per cent in the $500 - $699 range. During January and February, 1985, when the study was conducted, the federal and provincial government guaranteed the following payments through the Old Age Security, Guaranteed Income Supplement and Gains-A programs: $682 for single

TABLE 3.1.3

Senior Citizen Public Housing Respondents by Birthplace

Birthplace	Percentage
Canada	67.9
United Kingdom	16.3
U.S.A.	1.5
Finland	1.3
Germany	1.3
Netherlands	1.3
Ireland	1.0
U.S.S.R.	1.0
African Countries	.8
Asian Countries	.8
Hungary	.8
Italy	.6
Poland	.6
Yugoslavia	.6
West Indies	.4
Austria	.2
Czechoslovakia	.2
Portugal	.2
Romania	.2
Sweden	.2
Switzerland	.2
Other	2.3
Refusal	.2

Total N = 477

(Source: Question 7.4)

TABLE 3.1.4

Senior Citizen Public Housing Respondents
by Total Household Monthly Income*
January/February, 1985

Total Household Monthly Income	Percentage
Less than $500	15.3
$500-$599	22.1
$600-$699	35.6
$700-$799	12.1
$800-$899	7.5
$900-$999	2.7
$1,000+	4.6

Total N = 438

Missing Observations = 41

Senior Citizen Public Housing Respondents are defined as public housing tenants sixty years of age or more.

(Source: Question 7.1)

* Data source is income reported on the questionnaire not OFIS income data.

seniors and $1137 for married seniors. These amounts are increased quarterly.

The male respondents were more likely to have higher total monthly incomes than the females. Almost one-third (31.3%, N = 31) of the males had total monthly household incomes over $800, as compared to ten per cent (N = 34) of the females (see Table 3.1.5). Respondents who lived alone had lower total monthly household incomes than respondents living with others (see Table 3.1.6). Seniors in the 60 - 64 age group were in the lowest income group (see Table 3.1.7). Over sixty per cent (63.6%, N = 35) of this group had incomes of less than $500 per month as compared to eight per cent (8.4%, N = 32) of respondents sixty-five years or older (see Table 3.1.7).

Data from the Ministry of Housing's data source (i.e. UTMF) indicates that the principal source of income for seniors within the Ontario Housing Corporation buildings was the Old Age Security pension (78.1%), followed by the Gains disabled (6.5%) and the D.V.A. disability pension (4.6%). The secondary sources of income were as follows: 32.2 per cent received the Canada pension plan; 14.9 per cent received the Gains-Aged; 12.4 per cent received the guaranteed income supplement and; 5.3 per cent received additional monies from a private company pension. Eight per cent (7.8%) of seniors listed interest from stocks and bonds, bank, mortgage or other sources as their secondary source of income (see Table 3.1.8). Sixteen per cent (15.8%) had no additional sources of income.

TABLE 3.1.5

Senior Citizen Public Housing Respondents, Total Household Monthly Income* by Sex January/February 1985

Monthly Income Ranges	Male		Female		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Less than $500	(15)	15.2	(52)	15.3	(67)	15.3
$500 - $599	(14)	14.1	(83)	24.5	(97)	22.1
$600 $699	(25)	25.3	(131)	38.6	(156)	35.6
$700 - $799	(14)	14.1	(39)	11.5	(53)	12.1
$800+	(31)	31.3	(34)	10.0	(65)	14.8

Total N = 438

Missing Observations = 41

Chi-Square = 31.4 (p < .0001)

Senior Citizen Public Housing Respondents are defined as public housing tenants sixty years of age or more.

(Source: Questions 7.1, 2.10)

* Data source is income reported on the questionnaire not OFIS data.

TABLE 3.1.6

Senior Citizen Public Housing Respondents, Total Household Monthly Income by Household Status January/February 1985

Monthly Income Group	Lives Alone		Lives With Another		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Less than $500	(64)	16.2	(3)	7.0	(67)	15.3
$500 - $599	(95)	24.1	(2)	4.7	(97)	22.1
$600 - $699	(150)	38.0	(6)	14.0	(156)	35.6
$700 - $799	(51)	12.9	(2)	4.7	(53)	12.1
$800 - $899	(35)	8.9	(30)	69.8	(65)	14.8

Total N = 438

Missing Observations = 41

Chi-Square = 114.2 (p < .0001)

* Data source is income reported on the questionnaire not OFIS data.

Senior Citizen Public Housing Respondents are defined
as public housing tenants sixty years of age or more.

TABLE 3.1.7

Senior Citizen Public Housing Respondents,
Total Household Monthly Income* by Age
January/February 1985

Monthly Income Group	Age 60 - 64 N	60 - 64 %	65+ N	65+ %	Total N	Total %
Less than $500	(35)	63.6	(32)	8.4**	(67)	15.3
$500 - $599	(1)	1.8	(96)	25.1	(97)	22.1
$600 - $699	(10)	18.2	(146)	38.2	(156)	35.6
$700 - $799	(2)	3.6	(51)	13.4	(53)	12.1
$800 +	(7)	12.7	(57)	14.9	(65)	14.8

Total N = 437
Missing Observations = 42

Chi-Square = 116.8 (p < .0001)

Gamma = 0.54

Senior Citizen Public Housing Respondents are defined as public housing tenants sixty years of age or more.

* Data source is income reported on the questionnaire not OFIS data.

** There appears to be some underreporting of income, since it is expected that all those over age 65 + should be receiving at least $682 per month from federal and provincial sources.

TABLE 3.1.8

Senior Citizen Public Housing Respondents by Source of Income*

Source of Income	Primary Source		Secondary Source	
	N	%	N	%
None Reported	(0)	0	(75)	15.8
Old Age Security	(374)	78.1	(18)	3.8
Gains Disabled	(31)	6.5	(0)	0
D.V.A. Disability Pension	(22)	4.6	(15)	3.2
Canada Pension Plan	(9)	1.9	(153)	32.2
Gains - Aged	(0)	0	(71)	14.9
Guaranteed Income Supplement	(0)	0	(59)	12.4
Private company Pension	(5)	1.0	(25)	5.3
Interest	(5)	1.0	(37)	7.8
Other	(33)	6.9	(27)	4.9

Total N = 479

* This table presents only primary and secondary sources of income. A primary source provides the largest portion of a tenant's income, a secondary source the second largest portion. Any additional sources of income are not recorded. Some tenants have only one income source while others have several. This table may, therefore, under-represent the number of tenants reporting income from important smaller income sources such as GAINS-Aged.

Senior Citizen Public Housing Respondents are defined as public housing tenants sixty years of age or more.

(Source: Ministry of Housing, Unit Tenant Master File)

iii) Type and Size of Residence

The Ministry's data provides information on the type and size of the tenant's residence, and the presence or absence of elevators. These data show that seniors in public housing reside in apartments. The apartments are mainly one bedroom (81.0%), although fourteen per cent of the respondents lived in bachelor apartments and five per cent lived in an apartment with more than one bedroom. Almost one-quarter of the OHC tenants were in apartment buildings that do not have elevators. These apartments tend to be "two storey walk ups".

3.1.B Health Status

Health status is a multidimensional concept, and for purposes of this study was measured using several variables:

a) two subjective measures of health,

b) number of overall and interfering health problems,

c) type of health problem and extent of interference,

d) extent, if any, of hospitalization within the past 12 months.

These four variables were designed to be a comprehensive assessment of health status (see Ontario, 1985C:1).

i) Subjective Measures of Health

The majority of respondents in this study considered themselves to be in good or excellent health. In answer to the question, "How would you rate your overall health at the present time? Is it excellent, good, fair or poor?", 10.9 per cent of the respondents said their health was excellent and 45.5 per cent rated their health as good (see Table 3.1.9). About one-third of the sample considered their health to be fair (33.4%) and almost ten per cent (9.2) claimed to be in poor health. When asked "How much do your health problems (if any) stand in the way of your doing the things you want to do?", 36.3 per cent of the respondents said a little, and 21.9 per cent said a great deal (see Table 3.1.10).

The way in which the respondents perceived their health did not vary significantly across age groups. Over two-thirds (69.3%,

TABLE 3.1.9

Senior Citizen Public Housing Respondents
by Their Subjective Rating of Health

Subjective Rating of Tenant Health	Percentage of Respondents
Excellent	10.9
Good	45.5
Fair	33.4
Poor	9.2
Don't Know	1.0

Total N = 479

(Source: Question 6.6)

TABLE 3.1.10

Senior Citizen Public Housing Respondents by Whether Their Health Problems Stand in the Way of Their Doing the Things They Want to Do

Health Problems Stand in Way	Percentage of Respondents
Not at All	41.3
A Little	36.3
A Great Deal	21.9
Refusal	0.4

Total N = 479

(Source: Question 6.7)

N = 36) of persons 85 years of age and older reported their health as good or excellent, as compared to 58.6 per cent (N = 109) and 56.8 per cent (N = 100) of those 75 - 84 and 65 - 74 respectively (see Table 3.1.11). When asked if health problems stand in the way of doing the things they wanted to do, 17.3 per cent (N = 9) of the 85+ group answered "a great deal", as compared to 24.1 per cent and 19.6 per cent of the 75 - 84 and 65 - 74 aged groups respectively (see Table 3.1.12). Note that the 60 - 64 age group of respondents was more likely to say health problems stood in the way, and also more likely to perceive their health as fair or poor than the older age groups.

ii) Number of Health Conditions and Interfering Health Conditions

The number of health conditions reported by the seniors ranged from 0 to 8, with a mean of 2.8. Table 3.1.13 indicates that 6.3 per cent of the respondents reported no health conditions, 40.3 per cent reported one or two; 38.6 per cent reported three or four; 12.5 per cent reported five or six; and 2.3 per cent indicated seven or more health conditions.

The number of health conditions reported did not vary significantly across age groups. Table 3.1.14 shows that nearly half (48.1%, N = 25) of the 85+ group had 3 or 4 health conditions, and 39.6 (N = 74) and 31.8 (N = 57) per cent of seniors aged 75 - 84 and 60 - 74, respectively, indicated this number of conditions. Persons aged 85 + were not more likely than persons under the age of 85 to report more than four health

TABLE 3.1.11

Senior Citizen Public Housing Respondents
Subjective Rating of Health by Age

Subjective Rating of Health	Age									
	60 - 64		65 - 74		75 - 84		85 +		Total	
	(N)	%	(N)	%	(N)	%	(N)	%	(N)	%
Excellent	(4)	7.0	(18)	10.2	(22)	11.8	(7)	13.5	(51)	10.8
Good	(19)	33.3	(82)	46.6	(87)	46.8	(29)	55.8	(217)	46.1
Fair	(25)	43.9	(59)	33.5	(66)	35.5	(10)	19.2	(160)	34.0
Poor	(9)	15.8	(17)	9.7	(11)	5.9	(6)	11.5	(43)	9.1
Total N	(57)		(176)		(186)		(52)		(471)	

Missing Cases = 8

Chi-Square = 14.8 (p < .09)

(Source: Questions 6.6 and 2.10)

TABLE 3.1.12

The Extent to Which Senior Citizen Public Housing Respondents Report That Health Problems Stand in the Way of Their Doing the Things They Want to Do

Amount Health Problems Stand in the Way	Age									
	60 - 64		65 - 74		75 - 84		85 +		Total	
	(N)	%	(N)	%	(N)	%	(N)	%	(N)	%
Not at all	(14)	25.0	(75)	41.9	(87)	46.5	(21)	40.4	(197)	41.6
A little	(27)	48.2	(69)	38.6	(55)	29.4	(22)	42.3	(173)	36.5
A great deal	(15)	26.8	(35)	19.6	(45)	24.1	(9)	17.3	(104)	21.9
Total N	(56)		(179)		(187)		(52)		(474)	

Missing Cases = 5

Chi-Square = 12.1 ($p < .05$)

(Source: Questions 6.7 and 2.10)

TABLE 3.1.13A

The Number of Health Conditions Reported by Senior Citizen Public Housing Respondents

Number of Health Conditions	Number of Respondents Reporting Health Conditions	
	(N)	%
0	(30)	6.3
1 - 2	(193)	40.3
3 - 4	(185)	38.6
5 - 6	(60)	12.5
7 +	(11)	2.3

Total N = 479

(Source: Question 6.5)

TABLE 3.1.13B

The Number of Health Conditions Which Interfere With the Activities of Daily Living Reported by Senior Citizen Public Housing Respondents by the Extent of Interference

Number of Interfering Health Conditions	Number of Health Conditions Which Interfere With Daily Activities		Number of Health Conditions Which Interfere With Daily Activities A Great Deal	
	(N)	%	(N)	%
0	(87)	19.4	(268)	59.7
1 - 2	(197)	43.9	(142)	31.6
3 - 4	(124)	27.6	(33)	7.3
5 - 6	(35)	7.8	(5)	1.1
7 +	(6)	1.3	(1)	.2

Total N = 449

(Source: Question 6.5)

TABLE 3.1.14

The Number of Health Problems Reported by Senior Citizen Public Housing Respondents by Age

Number of Health Problems	Age									
	60 - 64		65 - 74		75 - 84		85 +		Total	
	(N)	%	(N)	%	(N)	%	(N)	%	(N)	%
None	(2)	3.5	(11)	6.2	(13)	7.0	(4)	7.7	(30)	6.3
1 - 2	(16)	27.6	(77)	43.0	(80)	42.8	(18)	34.6	(191)	40.1
3 - 4	(29)	50.0	(57)	31.8	(74)	39.6	(25)	48.1	(185)	38.9
5 - 6	(10)	17.2	(28)	15.6	(17)	9.1	(4)	7.7	(59)	12.4
7 +	(1)	1.7	(6)	3.4	(3)	1.6	(1)	1.9	(11)	2.3
Total N	(58)		(179)		(187)		(52)		(476)	

Missing Cases = 3

Chi-Square = 16.3 ($p < .18$)

(Source: Questions 6.5 and 2.10)

conditions. In fact, the opposite appears to be true. Sixteen per cent (15.6%, N = 28) of those aged 65 - 74 reported 5 or 6 health conditions, as compared to 7.7 per cent (N = 4) of those seniors aged 85 and over.

While 93.7 per cent of respondents reported one or more health conditions, 80.6 per cent of this group indicated that they had a health condition which interfered with their daily activities. Of the group indicating an interfering problem, 40.3 per cent described their health problems as interfering with their daily activities "a great deal" (see Table 3.1.13B). The number of interfering conditions did not increase with age.

iii) Type of Health Condition and the Extent to Which Health Condition Interferes With Daily Living

The type of health condition reported and the extent to which each condition was reported to interfere with daily activities is shown in Table 3.1.15. The conditions reported, in order of prevalence, were arthritis or rheumatism (68.1%), high blood pressure or heart trouble or the effects of a stroke (56.8%), circulation trouble in the arms or legs (37.4%), asthma, emphysema or chronic bronchitis (20.0%), ulcers and other intestinal disorders or gall bladder problems (19.0%), diabetes (12.3%), kidney and other urinary tract disorders (11.9%), thyroid or other glandular disorders (9.4%), anemia (7.3%), glaucoma (3.1%), liver disease (3.1%), and cancer or leukemia (3.1%). About one-quarter (26.3%) of the respondents reported the incidence of other health problems not identified in this study.

TABLE 3.1.15

The Type of Health Conditions Reported by Senior Citizen Public Housing Respondents and the Extent to Which it Interferes With Daily Activities

Health Condition	Prevalence		Extent of Interference					
			A Great Deal		A Little		Not at All	
	(N)	%	(N)	%	(N)	%	(N)	%
Arthritis or Rheumatism	(326)	68.1	(98)	30.2	(146)	44.9	(81)	24.9
Blood Pressure, Heart Trouble or Stroke	(272)	56.8	(51)	18.8	(110)	40.4	(111)	40.8
Circulation	(179)	37.4	(47)	26.4	(92)	51.7	(39)	21.9
Asthma, Emphysema or Bronchitis	(96)	20.0	(30)	31.3	(45)	46.8	(21)	21.9
Ulcers, Stomach, Intestinal, or Gall Bladder	(91)	19.0	(22)	24.4	(49)	54.4	(19)	21.1
Diabetes	(59)	12.3	(11)	18.6	(24)	40.7	(24)	40.7
Kidney, Urinary	(57)	11.9	(12)	21.1	(26)	45.6	(19)	33.3
Glandular	(45)	9.4	(2)	4.4	(15)	33.3	(28)	62.2
Anemia	(35)	7.3	(4)	11.4	(20)	57.1	(11)	31.4
Cancer/Leukemia	(15)	3.1	(6)	42.9	(1)	7.1	(7)	50.0
Glaucoma	(15)	3.1	(2)	13.3	(7)	46.7	(6)	40.0
Liver	(15)	3.1	(4)	26.7	(7)	46.7	(4)	26.7
Epilepsy	(4)	0.8	(0)	0.0	(3)	75.0	(1)	25.0
Polio	(3)	0.6	(2)	66.7	(1)	33.3	(0)	0.0
Parkinson's Disease	(2)	0.4	(1)	50.0	(1)	50.0	(0)	0.0
CP, MS or MD	(0)	0.0	(0)	0.0	(0)	0.0	(0)	0.0
Any Others	(126)	26.3	(51)	40.8	(52)	41.6	(22)	17.6

Total N = 479

Note: extent of interference may not sum to prevalence due to missing data

(Source: Question 6.5)

Considering the most prevalent conditions reported, the percentage of respondents who indicated that their health condition interfered with daily activities "a great deal" was 30.2 per cent (N = 98) of those with arthritis or rheumatism; 18.8 per cent (N = 51) of those with high blood pressure or heart trouble or the effects of a stroke; and 26.4 per cent (N = 47) of those with circulation trouble in arms or legs.

iv) The Extent of Hospitalization Within the Last Twelve Months

Respondents were asked if they had been a patient in a hospital overnight within the last 12 months. While hospitalization does not necessarily indicate poor health (i.e. surgical intervention such as a cornea transplant, accidents, etc.), it may affect the ability of the senior respondents to carry out activities of daily living. Table 3.1.16 shows that close to thirty per cent (29.0%) of the respondents reported a hospital stay. No differences across age groups were found in the hospitalization of the respondents (see Table 3.1.16).

The number of days respondents were hospitalized ranged from 1 to 86, with an average of 15.5. Over forty per cent (44.8%) were admitted for one week or less; 25.6 per cent were admitted for 8 - 14 days; and 29.6 per cent were admitted for more than two weeks. The number of days hospitalized did not vary across age groups. Of persons who were hospitalized, 66.9 per cent (N = 87) were admitted only once in the last year; 21.5 per cent (N = 28) were admitted twice. Just under twelve per cent (11.5%,

TABLE 3.1.16

Senior Citizen Public Housing Respondents by Hospitalization

Has Been Patient in Hospital Overnight in Past 12 Months

	Age									
	Total		60 - 64		65 - 74		74 - 84		85 +	
	(N)	%	(N)	%	(N)	%	(N)	%	(N)	%
Yes	(130)	29.0	(14)	26.4	(46)	27.2	(57)	32.4	(13)	26.0
No	(318)	71.0	(39)	73.6	(123)	72.8	(119)	67.6	(37)	74.0

Total N = 448*
Chi-Square = 1.6 (p < .65)

Number of Days Hospitalized

Days	Age									
	Total		60 - 64		65 - 74		75 - 84		85 +	
	(N)	%	(N)	%	(N)	%	(N)	%	(N)	%
1 - 7	(56)	44.8	(8)	57.1	(16)	36.4	(26)	46.4	(6)	54.6
8 - 14	(32)	25.6	(4)	28.6	(12)	27.3	(14)	25.0	(2)	18.2
15 +	(37)	29.6	(2)	14.3	(16)	36.4	(16)	28.6	(3)	27.3

Total N = 125*
Chi-Square = 3.6 (p < .72)

Number of Times Hospitalized

Times	Age									
	Total		60 - 64		65 - 74		75 - 85		85 +	
	(N)	%	(N)	%	(N)	%	(N)	%	(N)	%
1	(87)	66.9	(11)	78.6	(30)	65.2	(35)	61.4	(11)	84.6
2	(28)	21.5	(2)	14.3	(7)	15.2	(18)	31.6	(1)	7.8
3 +	(15)	11.5	(1)	7.1	(9)	19.6	(4)	7.0	(1)	7.8

Total N = 130
Chi-Square = 10.2 (p < .11)

* 28 seniors refused to indicate if they had been in the hospital overnight.
(Source: Questions 6.3, 6.4 and 2.10)

N = 15) of the hospitalized seniors were admitted three or more times over the period of a year. The number of hospital stays did not vary across age groups.

3.1.C Social Networks

Fully eighty per cent of the respondents had children; eighty per cent had relatives other than children and; eighty-eight per cent reported friends.

The frequency with which the respondents had contact with children, other relatives and friends varied by the type of contact. Table 3.1.17 indicates that about three-quarters (78.1%) of seniors spoke on the phone with one or more children at least once a week; 31.4 per cent had phone contact with a relative at least once a week and; 46.5 per cent were in contact by phone with at least one friend over a week's period.

Visiting tends to be less frequent than telephone contact. About one-quarter of the respondents either visited or were visited by children at least once per week. One-third of the respondents visited with their children once a month or less.

Visiting with friends was more frequent than visiting with children. One-third of the respondents visited with friends at least once per week. Comparing the frequency of visits with children, other relatives and friends revealed that the least frequent visits were with relatives other than children. Almost forty per cent of visits with other relatives took place less often than once a month; one-quarter of the respondents never visited with other relatives.

TABLE 3.1.17

Frequency and Type of Contact With Children, Relatives and Friends Reported By Senior Citizen Public Housing Respondents

Type of Contact	Frequency of Contact (Percentage)				
	Never	Once a Month or Less	2 or 3 Times a Month	Once a Week or More	Not Applicable
Phone Contact:					
Children	3.8	7.1	5.8	78.1	19.2
Relatives	11.1	29.0	8.1	31.4	20.0
Friends	7.9	12.3	7.7	46.5	12.3
Visiting in Other's Home:					
Children	11.5	37.0	11.5	20.9	19.2
Relatives	23.6	38.6	5.4	11.7	20.0
Friends	19.6	28.8	7.1	31.8	12.3
Visiting in Respondent's Home:					
Children	7.3	31.9	14.0	27.6	19.2
Relatives	24.2	38.0	7.1	10.2	20.0
Friends	14.8	30.3	7.7	34.6	12.3

Total N = 479

(Source: Questions 2.4, 2.6, 2.9)

Percentages may not sum to 100.00 due to 0.2 to 0.6 per cent who refused to answer these questions.

To determine the frequency of social contacts the respondents had on a monthly basis, an index was constructed. The index is a measure of the total number of contacts per month. The range on this index is from "0" (no social contact) to over 100 contacts per month (see Table 3.1.18). Over the period of a month, less than two per cent (1.9%) of the respondents had no social contacts. Nine per cent (9.0%) had fewer than ten social contacts; almost fifty per cent (47.6%) had 20-49 contacts; and about thirty per cent (30.6%) of the seniors had fifty or more contacts.

Respondents were asked to indicate if they had children, relatives or friends on whom they could depend within the local community or outside the community. Table 3.1.19 indicates that the proportion of respondents reporting children, relatives or friends on whom they could depend in the same city or community was 56.8 per cent, 45.9 per cent and 84.6 per cent respectively. About four per cent of the respondents reported that they had no children or relatives or friends on whom they could depend.

TABLE 3.1.18

Number of Social Contacts Per Month Reported by Senior citizen Public Housing Respondents

Number of Social Contacts per Month	Percentage
0	1.9
1-9	9.0
10-19	10.9
20-29	16.3
30-39	16.3
40-49	15.0
50-59	11.3
60-69	8.1
70-79	5.6
80-89	3.8
90-99	1.0
100+	0.8

Total N = 479

(Source: Questions 2.4, 2.6, 2.9)

TABLE 3.1.19

Number and Percentage of Senior Citizen Public Housing Respondents Reporting Children, Relatives and Friends on Whom They Can Depend by the Location of Contacts

Social Network	Contacts			
	Local Contacts		Contacts Outside the City or Community	
	(N)	%	(N)	%
Children	(272)	56.8	(269)	56.2
Relatives	(220)	45.9	(251)	52.4
Friends	(405)	84.6	(123)	25.7

Total N = 479

(Source: Questions 2.1, 2.2, 2.3, 2.8)

3.2 Difficulties With the Activities of Daily Living

This section describes the difficulties with the activities of daily living reported by senior citizen public housing tenants. The ability of respondents to carry out activities of daily living is measured with the use of eleven items. These items or activities are: light housework, heavy cleaning, preparing regular meals, grocery shopping, banking and preparing bills, getting around the community, bathing or showering, doing laundry, going up and down stairs, using a telephone and cutting toenails. The respondents were asked to indicate whether they could do the activity with "no difficulty", with "a little difficulty", with "a lot of difficulty" or whether they "could not do the activity at all by themselves". If the respondents indicated they "had a little difficulty", or "a lot of difficulty" or "could not do the activity at all by themselves", they were defined as having a difficulty.

Respondents were also defined as having a difficulty if they indicated that they received essential help within the past year for a particular activity even though they initially indicated they had no difficulty with the activity. Presumably, these respondents said they had no difficulty with the activity since they had help and were able to get by with this assistance (see Table 3.2.1, Column D).

The number of difficulties with activities of daily living reported ranges from 0 to 11, with an average of 3.7. Table

TABLE 3.2.1

Senior Citizen Public Housing Respondents: Their Difficulties With the Activities of Daily Living, Their Receipt of Help and Their Ability to Get By Without the Help Received

Activities of Daily Living	Difficulty With Activity						No Difficulty With Activity						Total N
	Received Help				Did Not Receive Help		Received Help				Did Not Receive Help		
	Could not get by without help		Could get by without help				Could not get by without help		Could get by without help				
	(A)		(B)		(C)		(D)		(E)		(F)		
	(N)	%	(N)	%	(N)	%	(N)	%	(N)	%	(N)	%	(N)
Grocery Shopping	(196)	42.1	(8)	1.7	(31)	6.6	(30)	6.4	(28)	6.0	(173)	37.1	(466)
Heavy Cleaning	(168)	37.2	(5)	1.1	(65)	14.4	(20)	4.4	(10)	2.2	(184)	40.7	(452)
Getting Around The Community	(106)	22.6	(6)	1.3	(53)	11.4	(19)	4.1	(11)	2.4	(270)	58.2	(465)
Light Housework	(91)	19.2	(2)	.1	(63)	13.3	(23)	4.9	(17)	3.6	(277)	58.6	(473)
Banking and Preparing Bills	(79)	17.0	(2)	.4	(10)	2.2	(23)	4.9	(13)	3.0	(339)	72.8	(466)
Laundry	(62)	13.5	(2)	.4	(20)	4.4	(15)	3.3	(13)	2.8	(347)	75.6	(459)
Preparing Regular Meals	(45)	9.5	(1)	.2	(31)	6.5	(15)	3.2	(10)	2.1	(372)	78.5	(474)
Bathing	(33)	6.9	(1)	.2	(58)	12.1	(5)	1.0	(1)	.2	(381)	79.5	(479)

TABLE 3.2.2

Number of Difficulties With Activities of Daily Living Reported by Senior Citizen Public Housing Respondents

Number of Difficulties With Activities of Daily Living	Per Cent
None reported	15.7
1	14.0
2	12.7
3	10.7
4	9.6
5	9.6
6	8.1
7	6.0
8	5.4
9	4.0
10	3.6
11	.6

Total N = 479

(Source: Questions 3.1, 3.11)

3.2.2 shows that 15.7 per cent of the respondents reported no difficulties; 37.4 per cent reported one to three difficulties; 27.3 per cent indicated four to six difficulties and; 19.6 per cent reported seven or more difficulties. It is important to note that almost eighty-five per cent of the respondents reported at least one difficulty.

The number of difficulties reported by the respondents varied by age. Table 3.2.3 shows that persons over the age of 85 reported more difficulties with activities of daily living than persons under the age of 85. Noteworthy was the finding that persons who lived alone did not report a greater number of difficulties than persons who lived with others.

Table 3.2.4 shows that over half of the respondents had difficulty going up and down stairs (53.9%), grocery shopping (55.3%) or heavy cleaning (53.9%). More than one-third experienced difficulties cutting toenails (40.3%), getting around the community (38.2%), and doing light housework (37.4%). About twenty per cent had difficulties doing laundry (20.7%), bathing or showering (20.3%) or preparing regular meals (19.2%). Six per cent (6.3%) reported difficulties using the telephone.

Table 3.2.5 shows that the respondents aged 85 + had more difficulty than those under the age of 85 doing light housework, doing laundry, banking and preparing bills, and cutting toenails. Persons aged 75 and older had more difficulty than those under the age of 75 getting around the community.

TABLE 3.2.3

Number of Difficulties With Activities of Daily Living Reported by Senior Citizen Public Housing Respondents by Age

Number of Difficulties with Activities Daily Living	Total		60 - 64		65 - 74		75 - 84		85+	
	(N)	%	(N)	%	(N)	%	(N)	%		
0	(75)	15.8	(9)	15.5	(40)	22.4	(19)	10.2	(7)	13.5
1 - 3	(178)	37.4	(21)	36.2	(69)	38.6	(74)	39.6	(14)	26.9
4 - 6	(129)	27.1	(19)	32.8	(39)	21.8	(53)	28.3	(18)	34.6
7+	(94)	19.8	(9)	15.5	(31)	17.3	(41)	21.9	(13)	25.0
Total N	(476)		(58)		(179)		(187)		(52)	

Chi-Square 16.649 (p = .05)

Gamma .15

* 3 respondents refused to give their age.

(Source: Questions 3.1, 3.2, ... 3.11 and 2.10)

TABLE 3.2.4

Type of Difficulties With Activities of Daily Living Reported by Senior Citizen Public Housing Respondents

Activities of Daily Living	(N)	%
Grocery shopping	(265)	55.3*
Going up and down stairs	(264)	53.9
Heavy cleaning	(258)	53.9*
Cutting your toenails	(192)	40.3
Getting around the community	(183)	38.2*
Light housework	(179)	37.4*
Banking and preparing bills	(114)	23.8*
Doing laundry	(99)	20.7*
Bathing	(97)	20.3*
Preparing regular meals	(92)	19.2*
Using the telephone	(30)	6.3

Total N = 479

* Includes those with difficulties and those who indicated they had no difficulty, although they indicated essential help within the past year (i.e. they could not get by without difficulty if this help was removed). (See Table 3.2.1, Columns A, B, C, D)

(Source: Questions 3.1, 3.2, ... 3.11)

TABLE 3.2.5

Type of Difficulties with Activity of Daily Living Reported by Senior Citizen Public Housing Respondents by Age

Activities of Daily Living *	Per Cent Had Difficulty										
	Age										
	60-64		65-74		75-84		85+		Total		
	(N)	%	(N)	%	(N)	%	(N)	%	(N)	%	X^2 P
Grocery Shopping	(35)	60.3	(94)	52.5	(106)	56.7	(29)	55.8	(264)	55.5	4.7 (p > .05)
Going up and down stairs	(36)	66.7	(96)	54.8	(106)	58.6	(26)	52.0	(264)	57.4	4.6 (p > .05)
Heavy cleaning	(33)	56.9	(82)	45.8	(109)	58.3	(31)	59.6	(255)	53.6	11.3 (p > .05)
Cutting your toenails	(14)	24.1	(59)	33.0	(87)	46.5	(32)	61.5	(192)	40.3	23.1 (p < .05)
Getting around the community	(21)	36.2	(57)	31.8	(82)	43.9	(22)	42.3	(182)	38.2	9.2 (p = .05)
Light Housework	(24)	41.4	(60)	33.5	(65)	34.8	(28)	53.9	(177)	37.2	9.4 (p < .05)
Banking and Preparing Bills	(11)	19.0	(30)	16.9	(52)	27.8	(21)	40.4	(114)	24.0	22.0 (p < .05)
Laundry	(14)	24.1	(32)	17.9	(40)	21.4	(13)	25.0	(99)	20.8	16.6 (p < .05)
Bathing	(10)	17.2	(31)	17.3	(42)	22.5	(13)	25.0	(96)	20.2	2.6 (p > .05)
Preparing regular meals	(11)	19.0	(32)	17.9	(31)	16.6	(16)	30.8	(90)	18.9	7.2 (p > .05)
Using the telephone	(4)	6.9	(8)	4.5	(13)	7.0	(5)	9.8	(30)	6.3	2.2 (p > .05)

Total N = 476

Missing Cases = 3

* Column numbers do not sum to 100.0 per cent because each activity (i.e. light housework) is taken from a separate table. Missing from this table are the percentages by age of those not having this difficulty.

(Source: Questions 3.1, 3.2, ..., 3.11, 2.10)

Difficulties with grocery shopping, going up and down stairs, heavy cleaning, bathing, preparing regular meals, or using the telephone did not vary across age groups.

3.3 Assistance Received With the Activities of Daily Living

This section describes the type of, frequency and arrangement for assistance received by senior citizen public housing tenants who experienced difficulties with the activities of daily living.

3.3.A Assistance With Activities of Daily Living

The use of assistance by the seniors in public housing was examined in relation to the eight activities of daily living discussed above. The only respondents being considered in this analysis are those who reported difficulties with the activities.

Table 3.3.1 (Column F) shows the percentage of seniors with difficulties who received assistance with the activities of daily living. The most frequent assistance was received by seniors having difficulties with banking and preparing bills (91.2%), grocery shopping (88.3%), laundry (79.8%), heavy cleaning (74.8%), getting around the community (71.2%), preparing regular meals (66.3%), light housework (64.9%), and bathing (40.2%).

TABLE 3.3.1

The Type of Assistance Senior Citizen Public Housing Respondents Received

Activities of Daily Living	(A) Respondents With Difficulty	(B) Respondents Receiving Help With Their Difficulty	(C) Percent of Respondents With Difficulty (A/479 X 100)	(D) Percent of Respondents Receiving Help (B/479 X 100)	(E) Respondents Who Received Help as a Percent of Respondents With Difficulty (B/A X 100)
Grocery Shopping	265	234	55.3	48.9	88.3
Heavy Cleaning	258	193	53.9	40.3	74.8
Getting Around the Community	184	131	38.2	27.3	71.2
Light Housework	179	116	37.4	24.2	64.9
Banking and Preparing Bills	114	104	23.8	21.7	91.2
Laundry	99	79	20.7	16.5	79.8
Meal Preparation	92	61	19.2	12.7	66.3
Bathing	97	39	20.3	8.1	40.2

* Total N = 479

3.3.B Frequency of Assistance With the Activities of Daily Living

Table 3.3.2 shows that the frequency of help received with activities of daily living varied by activity. The most frequent assistance received was with preparing regular meals (on average, 4 times a week or more), followed by bathing (on average, 2 to 3 times a week). Assistance with grocery shopping and/or laundry was typically received on a weekly or bi-weekly basis. Assistance with banking and preparing bills, light housework and getting around the community was received on an average of 1 to 2 times per month. The respondents received assistance less frequently for heavy cleaning; approximately one-quarter (26.4%, N = 51) had help once or twice a month and about one-third (30.1%, N = 58) had assistance less than once a month.

TABLE 3.3.2

Frequency of Assistance Received by Senior Citizen Public Housing Respondents
Reporting Difficulties With Activities of Daily Living

Activities of Daily Living	Frequency													
	4 times a week or more		2-3 times a week		once a week		1-2 times a month		less than once a month		other		total	
	(N)	%	(N)	%	(N)	%	(N)	%	(N)	%	(N)	%	(N)	%
Grocery Shopping	(3)	1.3	(16)	6.8	(113)	48.1	(80)	34.0	(16)	6.8	(7)	3.0	(235)	100.0
Heavy Cleaning	(7)	3.6	(11)	5.7	(30)	15.5	(51)	26.4	(58)	30.1	(36)	18.7	(193)	100.0
Getting Around the Community	(5)	3.8	(19)	14.6	(32)	24.6	(51)	39.2	(21)	16.2	(2)	1.5	(130)	100.0
Light Housework	(15)	12.9	(21)	18.1	(28)	24.1	(34)	29.3	(13)	11.2	(5)	4.3	(116)	100.0
Banking and Preparing Bills	-	-	(1)	1.0	(5)	4.8	(69)	66.3	(21)	20.2	(8)	7.7	(104)	100.0
Laundry	-	-	(7)	8.9	(30)	38.0	(33)	41.8	(5)	6.3	(4)	5.1	(79)	100.0
Meal Preparation	(28)	45.9	(23)	37.7	(1)	1.6	(2)	3.3	(3)	4.9	(4)	6.6	(61)	100.0
Bathing	(3)	7.7	(17)	43.6	(13)	33.3	(5)	12.8	(1)	2.6	-	-	(39)	100.0

NOTE: total percentages may not sum to 100.0 per cent due to rounding errors.

3.3.C Length of Time Help Was Received With the Activities of Daily Living

The length of time assistance had been received varied across activities. Close to one-half of those seniors who received help with preparing regular meals (49.2%, N = 30) or bathing (46.2%, N = 18) had received help for less than six months. Approximately one-third of the respondents receiving help with light housework (39.1%, N = 45) and laundry (30.8%, N = 24) received help for about the same time. It is noteworthy that for grocery shopping (27.7%, N = 64), heavy cleaning (22.5%, N = 43), getting around the community (28.1%, N = 36) and banking and preparing bills (22.5%, N = 23) about one-quarter of those receiving help had the help for more than four years (see Table 3.3.3).

TABLE 3.3.3

Length of Time Help Was Received by Senior Citizen Public Housing Respondents
Reporting Difficulties With the Activities of Daily Living

Activities of Daily Living	Length of Time															
	A Few Times Only		Less Than 6 Months		6 Months To 1 Year		More Than 1 To 2 Years		More Than 2 To 3 Years		More Than 3 To 4 Years		Over 4 Years		Total	
	(N)	%	(N)	%	(N)	%	(N)	%	(N)	%	(N)	%	(N)	%	(N)	%
Grocery Shopping	(7)	3.0	(30)	13.0	(50)	21.6	(33)	14.3	(34)	14.7	(13)	5.6	(64)	27.7	(231)	100.0
Heavy Cleaning	(20)	10.5	(34)	17.8	(34)	17.8	(23)	12.0	(22)	11.5	(15)	7.9	(43)	22.5	(191)	100.0
Getting Around the Community	(5)	3.9	(14)	10.9	(24)	18.8	(19)	14.8	(23)	18.0	(7)	5.5	(36)	28.1	(128)	100.0
Light Housework	(5)	4.3	(45)	39.1	(21)	18.3	(13)	11.3	(10)	8.7	(5)	4.3	(16)	13.9	(115)	100.0
Banking and Preparing Bills	(4)	3.9	(14)	13.7	(24)	23.5	(17)	16.7	(17)	16.7	(3)	2.9	(23)	22.5	(102)	100.0
Laundry	(4)	5.1	(24)	30.8	(21)	26.9	(9)	11.5	(5)	6.4	(4)	5.1	(11)	14.1	(78)	100.0
Meal Preparation	(5)	8.2	(30)	49.2	(7)	11.5	(4)	6.6	(2)	3.3	(2)	3.3	(11)	18.0	(61)	100.0
Bathing	-	-	(18)	46.2	(8)	20.5	(4)	10.3	(3)	7.7	(3)	7.7	(3)	7.7	(39)	100.0

NOTE: total percentages may not sum to 100.0 per cent due to rounding errors.

3.3.D Duration of Assistance With the Activities of Daily Living

Most of the respondents receiving assistance had help on a regular and on-going basis: i.e. grocery shopping (72.2%, N = 169), followed by laundry (69.6%, N = 55), banking and preparing bills (69.2%, N = 72), bathing (66.7%, N = 26), light housework (59.1%, N = 68), preparing regular meals (54.1%, N = 33), heavy cleaning (50.0%, N = 96), and getting around the community (49.2%, N = 64). About one-third of assistance with meal preparation (31.1%, N = 19) and one-quarter of assistance with bathing (23.1%, N = 9) and light housework (21.7%, N = 25) was on a time-limited basis (see Table 3.3.4).

TABLE 3.3.4

Duration of Help for Senior Citizen Public Housing Respondents Reporting Difficulties With the Activities of Daily Living

Activities of Daily Living	Duration									
	Once		Ongoing/ Regular		Ongoing/ Occasional		Time Limited		Total	
	(N)	%	(N)	%	(N)	%	(N)	%	(N)	%
Grocery Shopping	(7)	3.0	(169)	72.2	(46)	19.7	(12)	5.1	(234)	100.0
Heavy Cleaning	(19)	9.9	(96)	50.0	(61)	31.8	(16)	8.3	(192)	100.0
Getting Around the Community	(3)	2.3	(64)	49.2	(54)	41.5	(9)	6.9	(130)	100.0
Light Housework	(5)	4.3	(68)	59.1	(17)	14.8	(25)	21.7	(115)	100.0
Banking and Preparing Bills	(4)	3.8	(72)	69.2	(24)	23.1	(4)	3.8	(104)	100.0
Laundry	(3)	3.8	(55)	69.6	(13)	16.5	(8)	10.1	(79)	100.0
Meal Preparation	(3)	4.9	(33)	54.1	(6)	9.8	(19)	31.1	(61)	100.0
Bathing	(1)	2.6	(26)	66.7	(3)	7.7	(9)	23.1	(39)	100.0

NOTE: total percentages may not sum to 100.0 per cent due to rounding errors.

3.3.E Arrangements for Assistance With the Activities of Daily Living

Arrangements for assistance tended to be made by the physicians for those activities provided by community health and social service agencies. The seniors tended to make their own arrangements for help with assistance for getting around the community, (74.6%, N = 97), banking and preparing bills (72.1%, N = 75), heavy cleaning (67.4%, N = 130), grocery shopping (66.0%, N = 155) and laundry (59.5%, N = 47). Arrangements were often made by physicians for bathing (46.2%, N = 18), preparing regular meals (37.7%, N = 23), light housework (16.5%, N = 19) and laundry (13.9%, N = 11) (see Table 3.3.5).

TABLE 3.3.5

Persons Who Arranged Assistance for Senior Citizen Public Housing Respondents
Reporting Difficulties With the Activities of Daily Living

Activities of Daily Living	How Help Was Arranged															
	Respondent		Relatives		Physician		Neighbours/ Friends		Community Group		Public Health Nurse		Other		Total	
	(N)	%	(N)	%	(N)	%	(N)	%	(N)	%	(N)	%	(N)	%	(N)	%
Grocery Shopping	(155)	66.0	(45)	19.1	(7)	3.0	(11)	4.7	(10)	4.3	(1)	0.4	(6)	2.5	(235)	100.0
Heavy Cleaning	(130)	67.4	(23)	11.9	(14)	7.3	(18)	9.3	(3)	1.6	(2)	1.0	(3)	1.5	(193)	100.0
Getting Around the Community	(97)	74.6	(13)	10.0	(3)	2.3	(9)	6.9	(6)	4.6	-	-	(2)	1.6	(130)	100.0
Light Housework	(56)	48.7	(11)	9.6	(19)	16.5	(15)	13.0	(6)	5.2	(7)	6.1	(1)	0.9	(115)	100.0
Banking and Preparing Bills	(75)	72.1	(18)	17.3	(2)	1.9	(7)	6.7	(1)	1.0	-	-	(1)	1.0	(104)	100.0
Laundry	(47)	59.5	(9)	11.4	(11)	13.9	(6)	7.6	(3)	3.8	(3)	2.5	(1)	1.3	(79)	100.0
Meal Preparation	(23)	37.7	(6)	9.8	(23)	37.7	(2)	3.3	(1)	1.6	(4)	6.6	(2)	3.2	(61)	100.0
Bathing	(15)	38.5	-	-	(18)	46.2	(1)	2.6	(3)	7.7	(1)	2.6	(1)	2.6	(39)	100.0

NOTE: total percentages may not sum to 100.0 per cent due to rounding errors.

3.3.F Use of Formal Services

Respondents were asked if in the past year they or any family member had ever received help from various (23) community services, such as public health or other nurses (i.e. VON), physical therapists, homemaking services, footcare services, vision services, housing project staff, drop in centres, etc. On average, seniors and/or their family members used 1.7 services within the past year.

Table 3.3.6 indicates that seventy per cent of the respondents and/or their family members used at least one service. About twenty per cent (22.3%) of seniors used one service and 20.0 per cent of seniors used two services. A further 11.9 per cent had help from three services, and 7.9 per cent received the services of four organizations. Close to eight per cent (7.8%) of the respondents reported having used five or more services.

Table 3.3.7 shows that the most frequently used services in the past year were housing project staff (including building maintenance) (24.2%), public health nurses or other nurses (21.3%), drop in centres (20.0%), homemaking services (14.2%), vision services (14.2%), footcare services (11.5%), physiotherapists (10.6%), meals services (9.2%), nutrition counselling (7.9%), dental services (6.9%), special transportation (6.5%), friendly visiting (6.1%) and day hospitals (5.2%). For a detailed analyses of the frequency and arrangement

TABLE 3.3.6

Senior Citizen Housing Respondents by the Number of Community Services Used

Number of Community Services	Percentage
0	30.1
1	22.3
2	20.0
3	11.9
4	7.9
5	4.0
6+	3.8

Total N = 479

(Source: Questions 4.1, 4.2, ... 4.9)

TABLE 3.3.7

Senior Citizen Public Housing Respondents by the Type of Community Services Used

Community Services	Percentage
Housing project staff (including maintenance)	24.2
Public health nurses or other nurses	21.3
Drop in centre	20.0
Homemaking services (including laundry)	14.2
Vision services	14.2
Footcare services	11.5
Physical therapist	10.6
Meals services	9.2
Nutrition counselling	7.9
Dental services	6.9
Special transportation	6.5
Friendly visiting	6.1
Day hospital (i.e. out-patient clinic)	5.2
Hearing services	3.3
Legal services	3.3
Telephone or security	3.1
Mental health service	1.9
Community information	1.7
Drug/alcohol counselling	1.7
Occupational therapist	0.8
Family counselling	0.6
Credit/budget counselling	0.2
Day care clinic	0.2

Total N = 479

(Source: Questions 4.1, 4.2, ... 4.9)

for these services, see Appendix 1.

While the overall number of services used did not vary by age, Table 3.3.8 shows that certain services were more likely to be used by the most elderly seniors and/or their family members than others. Of the services used most frequently (i.e., by more than five per cent of the respondents), the use of public health nurses or other nurses, homemaking services, meal services, and friendly visiting tended to increase with age.

TABLE 3.3.8

Type of Community Services Used by Senior Citizen Respondents by Age*

Community Services	60-64 (N)	 %	65-74 (N)	 %	75-84 (N)	 %	85+ (N)	 %	Total (N)	 %	Chi-Square
Housing Project Staff (including maintenance)	(15)	25.9	(43)	24.0	(46)	24.6	(11)	21.1	(115)	24.2	.4 (p > .05)
Public Health Nurses	(7)	12.1	(33)	18.4	(43)	23.0	(18)	34.7	(101)	21.2	9.7 (p < .05)
Drop in Centre	(8)	13.8	(35)	19.6	(44)	23.5	(9)	17.3	(96)	20.2	3.1 (p > .05)
Homemaking Services (including laundry)	(5)	8.6	(18)	10.1	(32)	17.1	(13)	25.0	(68)	14.3	10.2 (p < .05)
Vision Services	(11)	19.0	(20)	11.2	(31)	16.7	(5)	9.6	(67)	14.1	4.3 (p > .05)
Footcare Services	(2)	3.5	(19)	10.6	(27)	14.4	(7)	13.5	(55)	11.6	5.6 (p > .05)
Physical Therapist	(5)	8.6	(21)	11.7	(20)	10.7	(5)	9.6	(51)	10.7	.5 (p > .05)
Meal Serivces	(2)	3.5	(12)	6.7	(18)	9.6	(11)	21.2	(43)	9.0	12.8 (p < .05)
Nutrition Counselling	(3)	5.2	(20)	11.2	(14)	7.5	(1)	1.9	(38)	8.0	5.8 (p > .05)
Dental Services	(6)	10.3	(12)	6.7	(12)	6.5	(3)	5.8	(33)	7.0	1.2 (p > .05)
Special Transportation	(3)	5.2	(8)	4.5	(18)	9.7	(1)	1.9	(30)	6.3	6.4 (p > .05)
Friendly Visiting	(3)	5.2	(7)	3.9	(12)	6.4	(7)	13.5	(29)	6.1	6.5 (p > .05)
Day Hospital	(4)	6.9	(10)	5.6	(8)	4.3	(2)	3.9	(24)	5.1	.9 (p > .05)

Total N = 475 - 476

Missing Cases = 3 or 4

* Column numbers do not sum to 100 percent because each category (i.e. Housing Project Staff) is taken from a separate table. Missing from this table are the percentages by age of those not using this service.

(Source: Questions 4.1, 4.2, ... 4.9)

3.4 Providers of Assistance on the Activities of Daily Living

3.4.A Sources of Formal and Infomal Assistance

Table 3.4.1 indicates the sources of assistance used by the respondents for activities of daily living. The most frequent providers of assistance were children (29.3%), community agencies (19.6%), paid help (18.2%), neighbours and/or friends (17.8%), other family (11.2%) and spouses (3.3%). About two-thirds of all assistance received by seniors was provided by informal sources of support.

Table 3.4.2 shows the sources of assistance for each of the eight activities of daily living, and indicates important variation across activities. Examining the "Total Informal" and the "Total Formal" columns, the data illustrate that assistance with bathing (71.8%, N = 28), light housework (64.7%, N = 75), and meal preparation (62.3%, N = 38) came mainly from formal sources of assistance. This reflects the fact that, as shown in Chapter 2, there are community services available to aid seniors with these difficulties, such as home care (light housework and laundry), meal services and public health nurses or other nurses. These services are available in all the municipalities surveyed, and as seen in the previous section in this chapter, were used by a sizeable proportion of seniors.

Assistance with banking and preparing bills (80.7%, N = 84), grocery shopping (73.6%, N = 173), getting around the community

TABLE 3.4.1

Senior Citizen Public Housing Respondents by the Percentage of Total Assistance Provided by Various Sources

Type of Assistance	Percent
Children	29.3
Community Agency	19.6
Paid Help	18.2
Neighbour/Friend	17.8
Other Family	11.2
Spouse	3.3
Other	0.5
Total N = 479	

TABLE 3.4.2

Senior Citizen Public Housing Respondents
Activities of Daily Living by Source of Assistance

Activities of Daily Living	Informal Sources:								TOTAL		Formal Sources:						TOTAL	
	Children		Other Family		Friends/ Neighbours		Spouse/ Housemate		INFORMAL SUPPORT		Project Staff		Community Agency		Other Formal		FORMAL SUPPORT	
	(N)	%	(N)	%	(N)	%	(N)	%	(N)	%	(N)	%	(N)	%	(N)	%	(N)	%
Grocery Shopping	(103)	43.8	(27)	11.5	(39)	16.6	(4)	1.7	(173)	73.6	(0)	0	(23)	9.8	(39)	16.6	(62)	26.4
Heavy Cleaning	(53)	27.5	(23)	11.9	(16)	8.3	(6)	3.1	(98)	50.8	(6)	3.1	(30)	15.5	(59)	30.6	(95)	49.2
Getting Around the Community	(41)	31.3	(11)	8.4	(37)	28.3	(4)	3.1	(93)	71.0	(1)	0.8	(13)	9.9	(24)	18.3	(38)	29.0
Light Housework	(18)	15.5	(9)	7.8	(8)	6.9	(6)	5.2	(41)	35.3	(0)	0.0	(40)	34.5	(35)	30.2	(75)	64.7
Banking and Preparing Bills	(44)	42.3	(13)	12.5	(25)	24.0	(2)	1.9	(84)	80.7	(0)	0.0	(6)	5.8	(14)	3.9	(20)	19.2
Laundry	(22)	27.8	(8)	10.1	(12)	15.2	(6)	7.6	(47)	60.7	(0)	0.0	(21)	26.6	(10)	12.7	(31)	39.2
Preparing Regular Meals	(8)	13.1	(1)	1.6	(8)	13.1	(6)	9.8	(23)	37.7	(0)	0.0	(35)	57.4	(3)	4.9	(38)	62.3
Bathing	(3)	7.7	(0)	0	(7)	17.9	(1)	2.6	(11)	28.2	(0)	0.0	(25)	64.1	(3)	2.6	(28)	71.8

* Note: Significant relationships are indicated above with an asterisk.

(71.0%, N = 93) and laundry (60.7%, N = 47) was provided largely by informal sources. In the case of heavy cleaning, about one-half of the assistance was provided by informal sources of help (50.8%, N = 98) and the other half from formal sources of assistance (49.2%, N = 95) including both community agencies and other formal sources such as "paid help". Across activities, children were by far the most frequent providers of help, with the exception of meal preparation and bathing where friends and neighbours played an important role.

3.4.B Differences in the Sources of Assistance Used

As indicated earlier, the sources of assistance received varied according to the type of activity of daily living. This section examines the relationships between the respondents' background characteristics, health status and the frequency of their social contacts and (i) the receipt of assistance and; (ii) the type of assistance received.

Measures of the background characteristics, health status, and the frequency of social contacts are developed in Section 3.1 of this report. Included in the list of background characteristics are age, number of years of formal education, birthplace and year of immigration, household status (i.e. living alone or not) and total household monthly income.

Two measures of health status are utilized: the extent to which the respondents' health problems stood in the way of doing the things they wished to do and the respondents' hospitalization during the past year. Social contacts are measured by the number of social contacts, either in person or by telephone, with children, other family, friends or neighbours per month.

Table 3.4.3 summarizes the factors that are related to the receipt of assistance and the type of assistance received. The table shows that the most significant discriminators are household status, years of formal education and hospitalization. Age, birthplace and year of immigration and frequency of social

TABLE 3.4.3

Summary of the Significant Relationships Between Type of Support Received by Senior Citizen Public Housing Respondents Reporting Difficulties With Activities of Daily Living and Their Background Characteristics, Health Status and Frequency of Social Contact

Activities of Daily Living	Background Characteristics				Health Status		Other
	Age of Head of Household	Household Status	Education Attained	Birthplace and Year of Immigration	Health Interfering With Activities	Recent Hospital Stay	Frequency of Social Contact
Grocery Shopping							
Heavy Cleaning	*	*	*				*
Getting Around the Community							
Light Housework	*	*	*	*		*	*
Banking and Preparing Bills							
Laundry							
Preparing Regular Meals		*				*	
Bathing			*	*		*	

* Note: Significant relationships are indicated with an asterisk.

contact were also found to be related to the type of support received.

The following section discusses these relationships in more detail.

i) Age

Tables 3.4.4 to 3.4.6 show the type of support (i.e. no support reported, informal support or formal support) for each activity by age. These tables show that:

a) respondents 75 years of age or more were more likely than respondents under the age of 75 to receive assistance for difficulties with heavy cleaning and/or light housework (see Table 3.4.4);

b) respondents aged 75 and over more frequently received assistance for heavy cleaning and light housework from formal services than those in the younger age groups (see Table 3.4.6);

c) respondents eighty-five years of age or more who experienced difficulties with heavy cleaning were more likely to report assistance from informal sources (see Table 3.4.5).

ii) Household Status

Tables 3.4.7 through to 3.4.9 indicate that the type of living arrangement was related to the type of support received for heavy cleaning, light housework and preparing regular meals. Specifically, seniors who lived alone were more likely than persons living with others to receive informal assistance for these activities.

TABLE 3.4.4

No Support Reported by Senior Citizen Public Housing Respondents Reporting Difficulties With Activities of Daily Living by Age

Activities of Daily Living	No Support Reported Age 60 - 64		65 - 74		75 - 84		85 +		Total		Chi-Square* Significance
	(N)	%	(N)	%	(N)	%	(N)	%	(N)	%	
Grocery Shopping	(4)	11.4	(13)	13.8	(12)	11.3	(1)	3.5	(30)	11.4	3.9 (p > .05)
Heavy Cleaning	(11)	33.3	(34)	41.5	(17)	15.6	(2)	6.5	(64)	25.1	25.6 (p < .01)
Getting Around the Community	(9)	42.9	(19)	33.3	(19)	23.2	(4)	18.2	(51)	28.0	6.5 (p > .05)
Light Housework	(13)	54.2	(26)	43.3	(21)	31.8	(3)	10.7	(63)	35.4	17.2 (p < .01)
Banking and Preparing Bills	(2)	18.2	(4)	13.3	(4)	7.7	-	-	(10)	8.8	6.0 (p > .05)
Laundry	(2)	14.3	(10)	31.3	(8)	20.0	-	-	(20)	20.2	7.9 (p > .05)
Preparing Regular Meals	(6)	54.6	(13)	40.6	(9)	28.1	(3)	18.8	(31)	34.1	6.3 (p > .05)
Bathing	(7)	70.0	(17)	54.8	(27)	64.3	(6)	46.2	(57)	59.4	5.5 (p > .05)

* Note that since the corresponding rows in Tables 3.4.4, 3.4.5 and 3.4.6 constitute a single table, the chi-square values reported are the same for each.

TABLE 3.4.5

Informal Support Received by Senior Citizen Public Housing Respondents Reporting Difficulties With Activities of Daily Living by Age

Informal Support

Activities of Daily Living	Age Groups										
	60 to 64		65 to 74		75 to 84		85 and over		TOTAL		Chi-Square* Significance
	(N)	%	(N)	%	(N)	%	(N)	%	(N)	%	
Grocery Shopping	(23)	65.7	(57)	60.6	(69)	65.1	(23)	79.3	(172)	65.2	3.9 (p > .05)
Heavy Cleaning	(13)	39.4	(24)	29.3	(44)	40.4	(17)	54.8	(98)	38.4	25.6 (p < .01)
Getting Around the Community	(7)	33.3	(29)	50.9	(45)	54.9	(12)	54.6	(93)	51.1	6.5 (p > .05)
Light Housework	(6)	25.0	(15)	25.0	(13)	19.7	(7)	25.0	(41)	23.0	17.2 (p < .01)
Banking and Preparing Bills	(6)	54.6	(20)	66.7	(41)	78.9	(17)	81.0	(84)	73.7	6.0 (p > .05)
Laundry	(7)	50.0	(14)	43.8	(21)	52.5	(6)	46.2	(48)	48.5	7.9 (p > .05)
Preparing Regular Meals	(3)	27.3	(8)	25.0	(7)	21.9	(5)	31.3	(23)	25.3	6.3 (p > .05)
Bathing	(2)	20.0	(5)	16.1	(3)	7.1	(1)	7.7	(11)	11.5	5.5 (p > .05)

* Note: Corresponding rows in Tables 3.4.4, 3.4.5 and 3.4.6 constitute a single table, the chi-square values reported are the same for each.

TABLE 3.4.6

Formal Support Received by Senior Citizen Public Housing Respondents Reporting Difficulties With Activities of Daily Living by Age

Formal Support

Activities of Daily Living	Age Groups								TOTAL		Chi-Square* Significance
	60 to 64		65 to 74		75 to 84		85 and over				
	(N)	%	(N)	%	(N)	%	(N)	%	(N)	%	
Grocery Shopping	(8)	22.9	(24)	25.5	(25)	23.6	(5)	17.2	(62)	23.5	3.9 (p > .05)
Heavy Cleaning	(9)	27.3	(24)	29.3	(48)	44.0	(12)	38.7	(93)	36.5	25.6 (p < .01)
Getting Around the Community	(5)	23.8	(9)	15.8	(18)	22.0	(18)	27.3	(38)	20.9	6.5 (p > .05)
Light Housework	(5)	20.8	(19)	31.7	(32)	48.5	(6)	64.3	(74)	41.6	17.2 (p < .01)
Banking and Preparing Bills	(3)	27.3	(6)	20.0	(7)	13.5	(4)	19.1	(20)	17.5	6.0 (p > .05)
Laundry	(5)	35.7	(8)	25.0	(11)	27.5	(7)	53.9	(31)	31.3	7.9 (p > .05)
Preparing Regular Meals	(2)	18.2	(11)	34.4	(16)	50.0	(8)	50.0	(37)	40.7	6.3 (p > .05)
Bathing	(1)	10.0	(9)	29.0	(12)	28.6	(6)	46.2	(28)	29.2	5.5 (p > .05)

* Note: Corresponding rows in Tables 3.4.4, 3.4.5 and 3.4.6 constitute a single table, the chi-square values reported are the same for each.

TABLE 3.4.7

No Support Reported by Senior Citizen
Public Housing Respondents Reporting Difficulties With
Activities of Daily Living by Household Status

No Support Reported

	Household Status						
Activities of Daily Living	Lives Alone		Lives With Another		Total		Chi-Square* Significance
	(N)	%	(N)	%	(N)	%	
Grocery Shopping	(28)	11.4	(3)	14.3	(31)	11.7	4.4 (p > .05)
Heavy Cleaning	(59)	25.0	(6)	27.3	(65)	25.2	12.6 (p < .01)
Getting Around the Community	(48)	28.2	(5)	35.7	(53)	28.8	.5 (p > .05)
Light Housework	(57)	35.6	(6)	31.6	(63)	35.2	7.8 (p < .05)
Banking and Preparing Bills	(9)	8.7	(1)	10.0	(10)	8.8	.4 (p > .05)
Laundry	(18)	20.7	(2)	16.7	(20)	20.2	4.4 (p > .05)
Preparing Regular Meals	(30)	37.0	(1)	9.1	(31)	33.7	15.3 (p < .01)
Bathing	(53)	60.9	(5)	50.0	(58)	59.8	.9 (p > .05)

* Note that since the corresponding rows in Tables 3.4.7, 3.4.8 and 3.4.9 constitute a single table, the chi-square values are the same for each.

TABLE 3.4.8

Informal Support Reported by Senior Citizen Public Housing Respondents Reporting Difficulties With Activities of Daily Living by Household Status

Informal Support

	Household Status						
Activities of Daily Living	Lives Alone		Lives With Another		Total		Chi-Square* Significance
	(N)	%	(N)	%	(N)	%	
Grocery Shopping	(156)	63.7	(17)	81.0	(173)	65.0	4.4 ($p > .05$)
Heavy Cleaning	(83)	35.2	(15)	68.2	(98)	38.0	12.6 ($p < .01$)
Getting Around the Community	(86)	50.6	(7)	50.0	(93)	50.5	.5 ($p > .05$)
Light Housework	(32)	20.0	(9)	47.4	(41)	22.9	7.8 ($p < .05$)
Banking and Preparing Bills	(76)	73.1	(8)	80.0	(84)	73.7	.4 ($p > .05$)
Laundry	(39)	44.8	(9)	75.0	(48)	48.5	4.4 ($p > .05$)
Preparing Regular Meals	(15)	18.5	(8)	72.7	(23)	25.0	15.3 ($p < .01$)
Bathing	(9)	10.3	(2)	20.0	(11)	11.3	.9 ($p > .05$)

* Note that since the corresponding rows in Tables 3.4.7, 3.4.8 and 3.4.9 constitute a single table, the chi-square values are the same for each.

TABLE 3.4.9

Formal Support Reported by Senior Citizen Public Housing Respondents Reporting Difficulties With Activities of Daily Living by Household Status

Formal Support

Activities of Daily Living	Household Status						
	Lives Alone		Lives With Another		Total		Chi-Square* Significance
	(N)	%	(N)	%	(N)	%	
Grocery Shopping	(61)	24.9	(1)	4.8	(62)	23.3	4.4 (p > .05)
Heavy Cleaning	(94)	39.8	(1)	4.6	(95)	36.8	12.6 (p < .01)
Getting Around the Community	(36)	21.2	(2)	14.3	(38)	20.7	.5 (p > .05)
Light Housework	(71)	44.4	(4)	21.1	(75)	41.9	7.8 (p < .05)
Banking and Preparing Bills	(19)	18.3	(1)	10.0	(20)	17.5	.4 (p > .05)
Laundry	(30)	34.5	(1)	8.3	([illegible])	31.3	4.4 (p > .05)
Preparing Regular Meals	(36)	44.4	(2)	18.2	(38)	41.3	15.3 (p < .01)
Bathing	(25)	28.7	(3)	30.0	(28)	28.9	.9 (p > .05)

* Note that since the corresponding rows in Tables 3.4.7, 3.4.8 and 3.4.9 constitute a single table, the chi-square values are the same for each.

iii) Education

The number of years of education attained by the respondents was related to the type of suppport reported for heavy cleaning and/or light housework. The data show that:

a) respondents with a primary school education were more likely than respondents with at least some post secondary education to receive assistance from informal sources for these activities (see Table 3.4.11);

b) respondents with at least some post secondary education were more likely than respondents without post secondary education to report assistance from formal sources (see Table 3.4.12).

iv) Birthplace and Year of Immigration

The type of support received was also found to differ when the birthplace and year of immigration were accounted for:

a) Canadian born respondents reporting difficulties were less likely to receive support than seniors born outside Canada for doing light housework, or bathing (see Table 3.4.13);

b) compared to the respondents born in Canada, and more recent immigrants to Canada (i.e. 1950 or later), immigrants to Canada before 1950 were more likely to receive support from formal sources for difficulties doing light housework, meals, and bathing (see Table 3.4.15);

c) compared to the other two groups, foreign born respondents who immigrated to Canada in 1950 or later were more likely to have help from informal sources for light housework and bathing (see Table 3.4.14).

v) Total Household Monthly Income

Total monthly household income was not found to be related to the type of support received for any of the eight activities of daily living analyzed here.

TABLE 3.4.10

No Support Reported by Senior Citizen Public Housing Respondents Reporting Difficulties With Activities of Daily Living by Education

No Support Reported

Activities of Daily Living	Grade 8 or Less (N)	Grade 8 or Less %	Grade 9 Plus (N)	Grade 9 Plus %	Total (N)	Total %	Chi-Square* Significance
	Years of Education						
Grocery Shopping	(12)	8.8	(19)	15.2	(31)	11.9	5.6 (p > .05)
Heavy Cleaning	(28)	21.1	(36)	29.5	(64)	25.1	10.3 (p < .01)
Getting Around the Community	(28)	29.5	(24)	27.3	(52)	28.4	1.9 (p > .05)
Light Housework	(28)	31.8	(34)	39.1	(62)	35.4	12.9 (p < .01)
Banking and Preparing Bills	(5)	7.8	(5)	10.4	(10)	8.9	1.3 (p > .05)
Laundry	(9)	16.4	(11)	25.6	(20)	20.4	1.9 (p > .05)
Preparing Regular Meals	(15)	29.4	(15)	39.5	(30)	33.7	3.0 (p > .05)
Bathing	(27)	54.0	(29)	67.4	(56)	60.2	1.8 (p > .05)

* Note that since the corresponding rows in Tables 3.4.10, 3.4.11 and 3.4.12 constitute a single table, the chi-square values are the same for each.

TABLE 3.4.11

Informal Support Reported by Senior Citizen Public Housing Respondents Reporting Difficulties With Activities of Daily Living by Education

Informal Support

Activities of Daily Living	Years of Education Grade 8 or Less (N)	%	Grade 9 Plus (N)	%	Total (N)	%	Chi-Square* Significance
Grocery Shopping	(97)	71.3	(72)	57.6	(169)	64.8	5.6 (p > .05)
Heavy Cleaning	(63)	47.4	(34)	27.9	(97)	38.0	10.3 (p < .01)
Getting Around the Community	(51)	53.7	(42)	47.7	(93)	50.8	1.9 (p > .05)
Light Housework	(30)	34.1	(10)	11.5	(40)	22.9	12.9 (p < .01)
Banking and Preparing Bills	(50)	78.1	(33)	68.8	(83)	74.1	1.3 (p > .05)
Laundry	(30)	54.6	(18)	41.9	(48)	49.0	1.9 (p > .05)
Preparing Regular Meals	(16)	31.4	(6)	15.8	(22)	24.7	3.0 (p > .05)
Bathing	(7)	14.0	(4)	9.3	(11)	11.8	1.8 (p > .05)

* Note that since the corresponding rows in Tables 3.4.10, 3.4.11 and 3.4.12 constitute a single table, the chi-square values are the same for each.

TABLE 3.4.12

Formal Support Reported by Senior Citizen Public Housing Respondents Reporting Difficulties With Activities of Daily Living by Education

Formal Support

Activities of Daily Living	Years of Education Grade 8 or Less		Grade 9 Plus		Total		Chi-Square* Significance
	(N)	%	(N)	%	(N)	%	
Grocery Shopping	(27)	19.9	(34)	27.2	(61)	23.4	5.6 (p > .05)
Heavy Cleaning	(42)	31.6	(52)	42.6	(94)	36.9	10.3 (p < .01)
Getting Around the Community	(16)	16.8	(22)	25.0	(38)	20.8	1.9 (p > .05)
Light Housework	(30)	34.1	(43)	49.4	(73)	41.7	12.9 (p < .01)
Banking and Preparing Bills	(9)	14.1	(10)	20.8	(19)	17.0	1.3 (p > .05)
Laundry	(16)	29.1	(14)	32.6	(30)	30.6	1.9 (p > .05)
Preparing Regular Meals	(20)	39.2	(17)	44.7	(37)	41.6	3.0 (p > .05)
Bathing	(16)	32.0	(10)	23.3	(26)	28.0	1.8 (p > .05)

* Note that since the corresponding rows in Tables 3.4.10, 3.4.11 and 3.4.12 constitute a single table, the chi-square values are the same for each.

TABLE 3.4.13

No Support Reported by Senior Citizen Public Housing Respondents Reporting Difficulties With Activities of Daily Living by Birthplace and Year of Immigration

No Support Reported

	Birthplace								
Activities of Daily Living	Canada		Outside Canada				Total		Chi-Square* Significance
			Immigrated Before 1950		Immigrated 1950 and Later				
	(N)	%	(N)	%	(N)	%	(N)	%	
Grocery Shopping	(19)	10.4	(6)	12.0	(5)	17.9	(30)	11.5	6.3 ($p > .05$)
Heavy Cleaning	(42)	23.3	(12)	26.1	(8)	29.6	(62)	24.5	2.3 ($p > .05$)
Getting Around the Community	(36)	28.8	(7)	21.2	(7)	35.0	(50)	28.1	4.5 ($p > .05$)
Light Housework	(49)	39.2	(7)	21.9	(5)	26.3	(61)	34.7	10.7 ($p < .05$)
Banking and Preparing Bills	(7)	8.8	(1)	4.4	(0)	0.0	(8)	7.1	1.8 ($p > .05$)
Laundry	(12)	17.9	(5)	27.8	(3)	25.0	(20)	20.6	5.0 ($p > .05$)
Preparing Regular Meals	(24)	38.7	(4)	21.1	(2)	20.0	(30)	33.0	6.0 ($p > .05$)
Bathing	(45)	64.3	(10)	55.6	(2)	25.0	(57)	59.4	10.9 ($p < .05$)

*Note: The chi-square may be unreliable when the expected cell size on a table is less than 5%. Since the corresponding rows in Tables 3.4.13, 3.4.14 and 3.4.15 constitute a single table, the chi-square values reported are the same for each.

TABLE 3.4.14

Informal Support Reported by Senior Citizen Public Housing Respondents Reporting Difficulties With Activities of Daily Living by Birthplace and Year of Immigration

Informal Support

Activities of Daily Living	Birthplace						Total		Chi-Square* Significance
	Canada		Outside Canada						
			Immigrated Before 1950		Immigrated 1950 and Later				
	(N)	%	(N)	%	(N)	%	(N)	%	
Grocery Shopping	(114)	62.3	(36)	72.0	(20)	71.4	(170)	65.1	6.3 ($p > .05$)
Heavy Cleaning	(67)	37.2	(19)	41.3	(12)	44.4	(98)	38.7	2.3 ($p > .05$)
Getting Around the Community	(60)	48.0	(19)	57.6	(12)	60.0	(91)	51.1	4.5 ($p > .05$)
Light Housework	(25)	20.0	(7)	21.9	(9)	47.4	(41)	23.3	10.7 ($p < .05$)
Banking and Preparing Bills	(58)	72.5	(18)	78.3	(8)	88.9	(84)	75.0	1.8 ($p > .05$)
Laundry	(32)	47.8	(6)	33.3	(8)	66.7	(46)	47.4	5.0 ($p > .05$)
Preparing Regular Meals	(12)	19.4	(6)	31.6	(5)	50.0	(23)	25.3	6.0 ($p > .05$)
Bathing	(8)	11.4	(0)	0.0	(3)	37.5	(11)	11.5	10.9 ($p < .05$)

*Note: The chi-square may be unreliable when the expected cell size on a table is less than 5%. Since the corresponding rows in Tables 3.4.13, 3.4.14 and 3.4.15 constitute a single table, the chi-square values reported are the same for each.

TABLE 3.4.15

Formal Support Reported by Senior Citizen Public Housing Respondents Reporting Difficulties With Activities of Daily Living by Birthplace and Year of Immigration

Formal Support

Activities of Daily Living	Birthplace								
	Canada		Outside Canada				Total		Chi-Square* Significance
			Immigrated Before 1950		Immigrated 1950 and Later				
	(N)	%	(N)	%	(N)	%	(N)	%	
Grocery Shopping	(50)	27.3	(8)	16.0	(3)	10.7	(61)	23.4	6.3 (p > .05)
Heavy Cleaning	(71)	39.4	(15)	32.6	(7)	25.9	(93)	36.8	2.3 (p > .05)
Getting Around the Community	(29)	23.2	(7)	21.2	(1)	5.0	(37)	20.8	4.5 (p > .05)
Light Housework	(51)	40.8	(18)	56.3	(5)	26.3	(74)	42.1	10.7 (p < .05)
Banking and Preparing Bills	(15)	18.8	(4)	17.4	(1)	11.1	(20)	17.9	1.8 (p > .05)
Laundry	(23)	34.3	(7)	38.9	(1)	8.3	(31)	32.0	5.0 (p > .05)
Preparing Regular Meals	(26)	41.9	(9)	47.4	(3)	30.0	(38)	41.8	6.0 (p > .05)
Bathing	(17)	24.3	(8)	44.4	(3)	37.5	(28)	29.2	10.9 (p < .05)

*Note: The chi-square may be unreliable when the expected cell size on a table is less than 5%. Since the corresponding rows in Tables 3.4.13, 3.4.14 and 3.4.15 constitute a single table, the chi-square values reported are the same for each.

vi) Health Status

Two measures of health status were used -- the respondents' perception of the extent to which their health stood in the way of their doing the things they wanted to do, and the hospitalization of the respondent in the past year. The analysis shows that:

a) the respondents' perception of the extent to which their health stood in the way of doing things they wanted to do was not significantly related to the type of support received with the activities of daily living;

b) respondents hospitalized within the past year were more likely than respondents not hospitalized to have formal support with light housework, preparing regular meals, or bathing (see Tables 3.4.16 through 3.4.18).

TABLE 3.4.16

No Support Reported by Senior Citizen Public Housing Respondents Reporting Difficulties With Activities of Daily Living by Hospitalization

No Support Reported

Activities of Daily Living	Hospitalization						
	Hospitalized		Not Hospitalized		Total		Chi-Square* Significance
	(N)	%	(N)	%	(N)	%	
Grocery Shopping	(9)	9.7	(22)	13.3	(31)	12.0	4.9 (p > .05)
Heavy Cleaning	(17)	20.2	(44)	27.0	(61)	24.7	4.7 (p > .05)
Getting Around the Community	(15)	23.8	(35)	30.7	(50)	28.3	1.9 (p > .05)
Light Housework	(13)	17.1	(49)	49.5	(62)	35.4	22.6 (p < .01)
Banking and Preparing Bills	(2)	5.4	(8)	10.8	(10)	9.0	1.2 (p > .05)
Laundry	(9)	20.0	(11)	20.8	(20)	20.4	2.9 (p > .05)
Preparing Regular Meals	(14)	26.4	(17)	43.6	(31)	33.7	6.9 (p < .05)
Bathing	(16)	41.0	(41)	71.9	(57)	59.4	10.3 (p < .01)

* Note that since the corresponding rows in Tables 3.4.16, 3.4.17 and 3.4.18 constitute a single table, the chi-square values are the same for each.

TABLE 3.4.17

Informal Support Reported by Senior Citizen Public Housing Respondents Reporting Difficulties With Activities of Daily Living by Hospitalization

Informal Support

	Hospitalization						
Activities of Daily Living	Hospitalized		Not Hospitalized		Total		Chi-Square* Significance
	(N)	%	(N)	%	(N)	%	
Grocery Shopping	(55)	59.1	(112)	67.5	(167)	64.5	4.9 (p > .05)
Heavy Cleaning	(28)	33.3	(66)	40.5	(94)	38.1	4.7 (p > .05)
Getting Around the Community	(36)	57.1	(53)	46.5	(89)	50.3	1.9 (p > .05)
Light Housework	(18)	23.7	(22)	22.2	(40)	22.9	22.6 (p < .01)
Banking and Preparing Bills	(27)	73.0	(54)	73.0	(81)	73.0	1.2 (p > .05)
Laundry	(18)	40.0	(29)	54.7	(47)	48.0	2.9 (p > .05)
Preparing Regular Meals	(11)	20.8	(12)	30.8	(23)	25.0	6.9 (p < .05)
Bathing	(5)	12.8	(6)	10.5	(11)	11.5	10.3 (p < .01)

* Note that since the corresponding rows in Tables 3.4.16, 3.4.17 and 3.4.18 constitute a single table, the chi-square values are the same for each.

TABLE 3.4.18

Formal Support Reported by Senior Citizen Public Housing Respondents Reporting Difficulties With Activities of Daily Living by Hospitalization

Formal Support

Activities of Daily Living	Hospitalization Hospitalized (N)	%	Not Hospitalized (N)	%	Total (N)	%	Chi-Square* Significance
Grocery Shopping	(29)	31.2	(32)	19.3	(61)	23.6	4.9 ($p > .05$)
Heavy Cleaning	(39)	46.4	(53)	32.5	(92)	37.3	4.7 ($p > .05$)
Getting Around the Community	(12)	19.1	(26)	22.8	(38)	21.5	1.9 ($p > .05$)
Light Housework	(45)	59.2	(28)	28.3	(73)	41.7	22.6 ($p < .01$)
Banking and Preparing Bills	(8)	21.6	(12)	16.2	(20)	18.0	1.2 ($p > .05$)
Laundry	(18)	40.0	(13)	24.5	(31)	31.6	2.9 ($p > .05$)
Preparing Regular Meals	(28)	52.8	(10)	25.6	(38)	41.3	6.9 ($p < .05$)
Bathing	(18)	46.2	(10)	17.5	(28)	29.2	10.3 ($p < .01$)

* Note that since the corresponding rows in Tables 3.4.16, 3.4.17 and 3.4.18 constitute a single table, the chi-square values are the same for each.

These findings are consistent with those presented earlier, namely that among the most prevalent community services providing assistance to elderly persons are homemaking services, visiting nurses and meal services. These services are largely arranged through a physician.

vii) Frequency of Social Contacts

Frequency of social contact -- measured by the number of social contacts per month (i.e. visiting or phoning) with children, other family and friends -- was related to the type of support received for grocery shopping and light housework. Persons with more frequent contact were more likely to receive informal support for these activities (see Tables 3.4.19 through 2.4.21).

Table 3.4.21 also shows very little variation in the percentage of respondents who received formal support when the number of social contacts per month was considered.

TABLE 3.4.19
No Support Reported by Senior Citizen Public Housing Respondents
Reporting Difficulties With Activities of Daily Living
by Number of Social Contacts per Month

No Support Reported

Activities of Daily Living	Number of Social Contacts per Month								TOTAL		Chi-Square* Significance
	0 to 19		20 to 39		40 to 59		60 or more				
	(N)	%	(N)	%	(N)	%	(N)	%	(N)	%	
Grocery Shopping	(10)	17.9	(13)	14.9	(5)	7.3	(3)	5.6	(31)	11.7	14.9 (p < .05)
Heavy Cleaning	(21)	34.4	(19)	24.7	(16)	24.2	(9)	16.7	(65)	25.2	6.8 (p > .05)
Getting Around the Community	(20)	40.8	(15)	26.8	(12)	27.3	(6)	17.1	(53)	28.8	9.1 (p > .05)
Light Housework	(22)	50.0	(21)	35.6	(16)	32.0	(4)	15.4	(63)	35.2	14.9 (p < .01)
Banking and Preparing Bills	(3)	12.5	(1)	2.7	(6)	16.2	(0)	0.0	(10)	8.8	11.2 (p > .05)
Laundry	(6)	27.3	(8)	21.1	(5)	20.0	(1)	7.1	(20)	20.2	7.9 (p > .05)
Preparing Regular Meals	(11)	42.3	(12)	36.4	(7)	35.0	(1)	7.7	(31)	33.7	1.9 (p > .05)
Bathing	(21)	70.0	(17)	56.7	(11)	47.8	(9)	64.3	(58)	59.8	8.6 (p > .05)

* Note: Corresponding rows in Tables 3.4.19, 3.4.20 and 3.4.21 constitute a single table, the chi-square values reported are the same for each.

TABLE 3.4.20

Informal Support Reported by Senior Citizen Public Housing Respondents
Reporting Difficulties With Activities of Daily Living
by Number of Social Contacts per Month

Informal Support Reported

Activities of Daily Living	Number of Social Contacts per Month										
	0 to 19		20 to 39		40 to 59		60 or more		TOTAL		Chi-Square* Significance
	(N)	%	(N)	%	(N)	%	(N)	%	(N)	%	
	(28)	50.0	(51)	58.6	(53)	76.8	(41)	75.9	(173)	65.0	14.9 (p < .05)
Heavy Cleaning	(18)	29.5	(27)	35.1	(28)	42.4	(25)	46.3	(98)	38.0	6.8 (p > .05)
Getting Around the Community	(17)	34.7	(29)	51.8	(24)	54.6	(23)	65.7	(93)	50.5	9.1 (p > .05)
Light Housework	(5)	11.4	(10)	17.0	(16)	32.0	(10)	38.5	(41)	22.9	14.9 (p > .01)
Banking and Preparing Bills	(14)	58.3	(28)	75.7	(28)	75.7	(14)	87.5	(84)	73.7	11.2 (p > .05)
Laundry	(6)	27.3	(18)	47.4	(14)	56.0	(10)	71.4	(48)	48.5	7.9 (p > .05)
Preparing Regular Meals	(3)	11.5	(9)	27.3	(8)	40.0	(3)	23.1	(23)	25.0	1.9 (p > .05)
Bathing	(1)	3.3	(2)	6.7	(5)	21.7	(3)	21.4	(11)	11.3	8.6 (p > .05)

* Note: Corresponding rows in Tables 3.4.19, 3.4.20 and 3.4.21 constitute a single table, the chi-square values reported are the same for each.

TABLE 3.4.21

Formal Support Reported by Senior Citizen Public Housing Respondents Reporting Difficulties With Activities of Daily Living by Number of Social Contacts per Month

Formal Support Reported

Activities of Daily Living	Number of Social Contacts per Month										
	0 to 19		20 to 39		40 to 59		60 or more		TOTAL		Chi-Square* Significance
	(N)	%	(N)	%	(N)	%	(N)	%	(N)	%	
Grocery	(18)	32.1	(23)	36.4	(11)	15.9	(10)	18.5	(62)	23.3	14.9 (p < .05)
Heavy Cleaning	(22)	36.1	(31)	40.3	(22)	33.3	(20)	37.0	(95)	36.8	6.8 (p > .05)
Getting Around the Community	(12)	24.5	(12)	21.4	(8)	18.2	(6)	17.1	(38)	20.7	9.1 (p > .05)
Light Housework	(17)	38.6	(28)	47.5	(18)	36.0	(12)	46.2	(75)	41.9	14.9 (p < .01)
Banking and Preparing Bills	(7)	29.2	(8)	21.6	(3)	8.1	(2)	12.5	(20)	17.5	11.2 (p > .05)
Laundry	(10)	45.5	(12)	31.6	(6)	24.0	(3)	21.4	(31)	31.3	7.9 (p > .05)
Preparing Regular Meals	(12)	46.2	(12)	36.4	(5)	25.0	(9)	69.2	(38)	41.3	1.9 (p > .05)
Bathing	(8)	26.7	(11)	36.7	(7)	30.4	(2)	14.3	(28)	28.9	8.6 (p > .05)

* Note: Corresponding rows in Tables 3.4.19, 3.4.20 and 3.4.21 constitute a single table, the chi-square values reported are the same for each.

3.5 Sufficient Help With the Activities of Daily Living

This section considers the extent to which senior citizen public housing tenants who experience difficulties with the activities of daily living receive the help they indicate they need. Four measures of "sufficient" help are used. The first three measures relate to the issue of assistance received. For each activity, respondents were asked if the help they received was "enough help" and "the right kind of help". They were also asked, "without help would you have been able to get by". Nearly all seniors who were receiving help indicated they were receiving both "enough" and the "right kind of help" (see Table 3.5.1).

Table 3.5.2 illustrates the variation by activity in the respondents' perceived need for assistance. The percentage of respondents who indicated that they would not be able to get by without the assistance they received ranged from 46.2 per cent (N = 18) of those receiving help with bathing to 22.6 per cent (N = 53) for assistance with grocery shopping. Also, almost one-half (46.7%, N = 28) of seniors having assistance with meal preparation indicated that without the help they could only get by with "a lot of difficulty".

The data indicate that the majority of respondents experiencing difficulties with the activities of daily living were receiving the assistance they wanted. A group of respondents who were experiencing difficulties were not receiving assistance (see Table 3.5.3, Column C). In descending order, the

TABLE 3.5.1

Senior Citizen Public Housing Respondents' Evaluation of The Extent To Which the Assistance They Are Receiving With Activities of Daily Living Is Enough Help and The Right Kind of Help

Activities of Daily Living	Enough Help						Right Kind of Help					
	Yes		No		Total		Yes		No		Total	
	(N)	%	(N)	%	(N)	%	(N)	%	(N)	%	(N)	%
Grocery Shopping	(230)	98.3	(4)	1.7	(234)	100.0	(231)	98.7	(2)	0.8	(233)	100.0
Heavy Cleaning	(185)	95.9	(8)	4.1	(193)	100.0	(188)	97.4	(5)	2.6	(193)	100.0
Getting Around the Community	(126)	96.9	(4)	3.1	(130)	100.0	(128)	99.2	(1)	0.8	(129)	100.0
Light Housework	(107)	92.2	(9)	7.8	(116)	100.0	(108)	93.1	(8)	6.9	(116)	100.0
Banking and Preparing Bills	(104)	100.0	(0)	0.0	(104)	100.0	(104)	100.0	(0)	0.0	(104)	100.0
Laundry	(78)	98.7	(1)	1.3	(79)	100.0	(77)	98.7	(1)	1.3	(78)	100.0
Preparing Regular Meals	(59)	96.7	(2)	3.3	(61)	100.0	(57)	93.4	(4)	6.6	(61)	100.0
Bathing	(38)	97.4	(1)	2.6	(39)	100.0	(37)	94.9	(2)	5.1	(39)	100.0

TABLE 3.5.2

Senior Citizen Public Housing Respondents' Evaluation of Their Ability to Get By Should They Not Have the Help They are Receiving

Activities of Daily Living	Ability To Get By									
	With No Difficulty		A Little Difficulty		A Lot Of Difficulty		Not At All		Total	
	(N)	%	(N)	%	(N)	%	(N)	%	(N)	%
Grocery Shopping	(8)	3.4	(86)	36.8	(87)	37.2	(53)	22.6	(234)	100.0
Heavy Cleaning	(5)	2.6	(60)	31.1	(75)	38.9	(53)	27.5	(193)	100.0
Getting Around the Community	(6)	4.7	(43)	33.3	(47)	36.4	(33)	25.6	(129)	100.0
Light Housework	(2)	1.7	(39)	33.9	(42)	36.5	(32)	27.8	(115)	100.0
Banking and Preparing Bills	(2)	1.9	(41)	39.4	(30)	28.8	(31)	29.8	(104)	100.0
Laundry	(2)	2.5	(24)	30.4	(26)	32.9	(27)	34.2	(79)	100.0
Preparing Regular Meals	(1)	1.7	(17)	28.3	(28)	46.7	(14)	23.3	(60)	100.0
Bathing	(1)	2.6	(10)	25.6	(10)	25.6	(18)	46.2	(39)	100.0

Note: total percentages may not sum to 100.0 per cent due to rounding errors

TABLE 3.5.3

Patterns of Difficulties with Activities of Daily Living, Assistance Recieved, and Assistance Not Sought by Senior Citizen Public Housing Respondents

Activities of Daily Living	TOTAL Respondents Experiencing Difficulty	Respondents Experiencing Difficulty				Respondents Experiencing Difficulty Without Recieving Assistance*					
		Received Assistance		Without Receiving Assistance		Requested Assistance		Has Not Requested Assistance		Refusals or Missing	
Tenant Group Columns	(A)	(B)		(C)		(D)		(E)		(F)	
	(N)	(N)	% of Total	(N)	% of Total	(N)	% of Total	(N)	% of Total	(N)	% of Total
Grocery Shopping	(265)	(234)	88.3	(31)	11.7	(19)	7.2	(10)	3.8	(2)	0.7
Heavy Cleaning	(258)	(193)	74.8	(65)	25.2	(38)	14.7	(23)	8.9	(4)	1.5
Getting Around the Community	(184)	(131)	71.2	(53)	28.8	(22)	12.0	(28)	15.3	(3)	1.6
Light Housework	(179)	(116)	64.9	(63)	35.2	(29)	15.6	(34)	19.0	(0)	0.0
Banking and Preparing Bills	(114)	(104)	91.2	(10)	8.8	(5)	4.4	(5)	4.4	(0)	0.0
Laundry	(99)	(79)	79.8	(20)	20.2	(10)	10.0	(10)	10.0	(0)	0.0
Preparing Regular Meals	(92)	(61)	66.3	(31)	33.7	(15)	16.3	(16)	17.4	(0)	0.0
Bathing	(97)	(39)	40.2	(58)	59.8	(12)	12.4	(43)	44.3	(3)	3.1

* Note: Tenant Groups in columns D, E and F may not sum to column C due to missing data

percentages of these respondents were:

59.8% (N = 58) of respondents with difficulties bathing

35.2% (N = 63) of respondents with difficulties doing light houswork

33.7% (N = 31) of respondents with difficulties preparing regular meals

28.8% (N = 53) of respondents with difficulties getting around the community

25.2% (N = 65) of respondents with difficulties doing heavy cleaning

20.2% (N = 20) of respondents with difficulties doing laundry

11.7% (N = 31) of respondents with difficulties grocery shopping

8.8% (N = 10) of respondents with difficulties banking and preparing bills

Not all of the respondents experiencing difficulties and not receiving assistance requested help. Table 3.5.3 (Column D) shows the percentage of seniors with difficulties and no help who indicated they wanted help. The percentage requesting assistance varies across activities. For example, 7.2 per cent (N = 19) of respondents with difficulties and no help grocery shopping requested help compared to 12.4 per cent (N = 12) of those having difficulty and no assistance with bathing.

3.6 Comparisons of the Findings From the Senior Citizen Public Housing Survey to Findings From the Survey of "Elderly Residents in Ontario"

As mentioned in Chapter 1, in 1981 the United Senior Citizens of Ontario (USCO), with support from the Ontario government and the Federal government, sponsored a province-wide study of elderly persons residing outside of institutional settings. The principal objective of the study was to gather baseline information on the living situation of older persons. In this section, findings from the survey of senior citizen public housing tenants are being compared with those from the USCO study in the following areas:

I) demographic and social background characteristics
II) aspects of health status
III) difficulties with activities of daily living
IV) the use of community services
V) the sources of assistance

3.6.A. Comparisons on Demographic and Social Background Characteristics

The sample of senior tenants from public housing in Ontario differed considerably from the USCO sample of elderly persons in Ontario. While one-quarter of the respondents in the USCO sample resided in apartments, virtually all of the public housing seniors were apartment dwellers. Nine per cent of the respondents in the USCO survey lived in apartments designated for senior citizens. Two-thirds of all USCO respondents owned their own residence. The public housing seniors tended to be older, on average, (see Table 3.6.1), more likely to be female (79% vs. 58%), and more likely to live alone (88% vs. 30%). The public housing seniors had less formal education, on average, than the USCO sample; (i.e. 54% of public housing seniors had grade 8 or less education, compared to 43% of the USCO sample). Total household monthly income was significantly less for the public housing seniors than the persons in the USCO survey. Table 3.6.2 shows that almost sixty per cent of USCO respondents had total monthly incomes over $800 in 1982 as compared to fifteen per cent of respondents in the public housing survey in 1985. Had the two studies been carried out during the same year, it would have resulted in a wider disparity between the two samples.

The senior citizen public housing respondents were found to have extensive social networks including children, siblings, other relatives, friends and neighbours. These findings parallel those found for the USCO seniors. As well, both groups of respondents were in regular contact with their children,

TABLE 3.6.1

A Comparison of Senior Citizen Public Housing Respondents to Respondents from the USCO Survey: Age

Age	Public Housing Respondents %	USCO Respondents %
65 - 74	43	60
75 - 84	45	33
85 +	12	7
Total N	418	832

Missing Cases: Public Housing Survey = 61 (including those aged 60-64)

Data Sources: Elderly Residents in Ontario: An Overview. Ontario: Ministry for Senior Citizens' Affairs, Seniors Secretariat, and the United Senior Citizens of Ontario September 1985.
Survey of Senior Citizen Public Housing Respondents

TABLE 3.6.2

A Comparison of the Total Household Monthly Income* of Senior Citizen Public Housing Repondents to Respondents From the USCO Survey

Total Monthly Household Income	Percentages Public Housing Respondents 1985	USCO Respondents 1982
Below $600	33	27
$600 to $799	52	15
$800 or more	15	58
Total N	382	788

Missing Cases: Public Housing Survey = 58 (including those aged 60 to 64 years of age)

Data Sources: Elderly Residents In Ontario: Income Group Differences, Ontario Ministry for Senior Citizens' Affairs, Seniors Secretariat, and the United Senior Citizens of Ontario, September 1985.

* Note: The USCO survey was undertaken during 1982, the OHC survey in early 1985. Direct comparison between the incomes of each of these groups is not possible as the incomes of some USCO respondents rose during the 1982 to 1985 period. The actual differences in incomes between these two groups is therfore greater than indicated by the data presented in this table.

relatives and friends.

3.6.B Comparisons on Health Status

Comparisons of the health status of seniors in public housing to respondents in the USCO sample indicate that there was very little difference between groups in the subjective rating of health or the extent to which health problems stand in the way of doing the things they want to do. There were, however, important differences between the two groups in the relationship between health status and age. In the USCO study, the youngest group of seniors rated their health better than the more elderly group, whereas this difference by age was not found in the public housing sample (see Table 3.6.3). Similarily, Table 3.6.4 shows that the most elderly group of respondents from the USCO survey were more likely than the public housing respondents to report that their health stood in the way "a great deal" in doing things they want to do.

Comparisons of hospitalization of the respondents indicate that a greater proportion of respondents from the public housing survey (29%) was hospitalized within the twelve months prior to the study than respondents from the USCO survey (19%) (see Ontario, 1985c: 7).

TABLE 3.6.3

A Comparison of Senior Citizen Public Housing Respondents to Respondents From the USCO Survey: Subjective Rating of Health by Age

Subjective Rating of Health	65 - 74		75 - 84		85 +		Total	
	USCO	Public Housing	USCO	Public Housing	USCO	Public Housing	USCO	Public Housing
	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
Excellent	17	10	15	12	10	14	16	11
Good	48	47	43	47	41	56	45	46
Fair	28	34	32	36	33	19	30	34
Poor	7	10	10	6	16	12	9	9
Total N	495	176	274	186	63	52	832	414

Missing Cases: USCO = 4
Public Housing = 65 including those aged 60 - 64

Data Sources: Survey of Senior Citizen Public Housing Respondents
Elderly Residents in Ontario: An Overview. Ontario: Minister for Senior Citizens' Affairs, Seniors Secretariat and The United Senior Citizens of Ontario, September 1985.

TABLE 3.6.4

A Comparison of Senior Citizen Public Housing Respondents to Respondents From the USCO Survey: The Extent to Which Health Problems Stand in the Way of Their Doing the Things They Want to Do

Health Problems in Way	65 - 74		75 - 84		85 +		Total	
	USCO	Public Housing	USCO	Public Housing	USCO	Public Housing	USCO	Public Housing
	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
Not at All	44	42	34	47	30	40	39	42
A Little	39	39	43	29	38	42	40	37
A Great Deal	17	20	23	24	32	17	21	22
Total N	495	179	274	187	63	52	832	418

Missing Cases = 5
USCO = 4
Public Housing = 61 including those aged 60 - 64

Data Source: Survey of Senior Citizen Public Housing Respondents Elderly Residents in Ontario: An Overview. Ontario: Minister for Senior Citizens' Affairs, Seniors Secretariate and The United Senior Citizens of Ontario, September 1985.

3.6.C Comparisons on the Activities of Daily Living

The questions on the ability of respondents to carry out the activities of daily living are not strictly comparable between the USCO and public housing study for a number of reasons. First, the list of activities of daily living differed across the two studies. However, both surveys included grocery shopping, heavy cleaning, banking and preparing bills (handling money), bathing, preparing regular meals and using the telephone.

Second, respondents in the USCO study were "regarded as having a disability" if they indicated they needed help or they were unable to perform the activity. In the public housing survey, respondents were asked if they had difficulty and/or received help with each of the activities of daily living.

In light of the differences between the two surveys, caution must be taken in using the comparative data.

Respondents from the public housing survey had a greater number of difficulties with activities of daily living (or disabilities) than the seniors in the USCO survey. For example, sixteen per cent of senior citizen public housing respondents report no difficulties in the activities of daily living, compared to sixty-nine per cent for USCO respondents (Ontario, 1985c: 3). This difference may partly be due to the different lists of activities used in the two surveys.

This same finding appears when the per cent having specific disabilities are compared. Table 3.6.5 shows that substantially more public housing respondents had difficulties with grocery shopping, heavy cleaning, banking and preparing bills, preparing regular meals, and bathing. (Note that the difference may be inflated for grocery shopping as the question in the USCO survey asked respondents to assume they had transportation, but this assumption was not made in the public housing survey.)

Both studies show older respondents were more likely than younger respondents to report difficulties in a number of activities of daily living.

TABLE 3.6.5

A Comparison of Senior Citizen Public Housing Respondents to Respondents from the USCO Survey: The Percentage Having Difficulties With Activities of Daily Living

Type of Assistance	Public Housing Respondents %	USCO Respondents %
Grocery Shopping	55	15
Heavy Cleaning (Housework)	53	22
Banking and Preparing Bills (Handling Money)	25	7
Preparing Regular Meals	19	8
Bathing	21	8
Using the Telephone	6	7
Total N	421	843

Missing Cases: Public Housing = 58 including those aged 60-64.

Data Sources: Survey of Senior Citizen Public Housing Respondents Elderly Residents in Ontario: Their Health Status and the Use of the Health Care System, Ontario: Minister for Senior Citizen Affairs, Seniors Secretariat and the United Senior Citizens of Ontario, September 1985.

3.6.D Comparisons on the Use of Community Services

The use of specific community services appears to be greater among seniors in public housing than among respondents in the USCO survey. In both surveys, respondents were asked to indicate their use of visiting nurses (public health or VON), homemaking services (visiting, Red Cross, homemakers or Home Care), Meals on Wheels and Friendly Visiting over a twelve month period. Percentages of respondents in the two surveys who used these services are compared below:

	USCO %	Public Housing %
Visiting Nurses	8	21
Homemakers/Home Care	6	14
Meal Services	1	9
Friendly Visiting	1	6

(see Elderly Residents in Ontario Community Services. Ontario Minister for Senior Citizens' Affairs, Seniors Secretariat, September, 1985).

TABLE 3.6.6

A Comparison of Senior Citizen Public Housing Respondents to USCO Respondents: The Percentage of Total Assistance Provided

Sources of Assistance	Public Housing Respondents %	USCO Respondents %
Children	30	28
Other Family	11	22
Paid Help	19	22
Spouses	3	15
Neighbour/Friend	18	9
Community Agency	18	3
Other	1	1
Total N	418	837
Total Types of Assistance	1155	

Missing Cases:	Public Housing Survey = 61 (including those aged 60-64).
Data Sources:	Survey of Respondents in Public Housing Elderly Residents in Ontario: Social Contacts, Providers of Assistance and Requests For Additional Assistance, Ontario: Minister for Senior Citizens Affairs Senior Secretariat September 1985.

3.6.E Comparisons on the Sources of Assistance

Table 3.6.6 shows the proportion of total assistance provided by children, other family, paid help, spouses, neighbours/friends, community agencies and others for both groups of respondents. These data show a number of similarities and a few important differences on sources of assistance.

First, about thirty per cent of all assistance was provided by children and around twenty per cent was paid help for respondents from both the public housing and USCO surveys.

Second, respondents from the USCO survey were more likely to report assistance from other family (22%), and spouses (15%) than the public housing respondents (11% and 3% respectively).

Third, public housing respondents were more likely to report assistance from neighbours/friends (18%) and community agencies (18%) than the USCO respondents (9% and 3% respectively).

CHAPTER 4 SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

Introduction and Purpose of this Survey

This study came into focus for two principal reasons. First, the substantial growth in numbers and percentages of senior citizens as well as the increase in life expectancy is having a profound effect on Ontario's demographic composition. The average age of the population is increasing and will continue to increase well into the next century.

Second, there is mounting evidence to suggest that seniors prefer to remain in their own homes for as long as possible. Given this preference on the part of seniors, and their increase in numbers, the overall demand for support services is expected to increase.

These trends have implications for the future provision and management of assisted housing in Ontario. With the aging of tenants in public housing, concern is expressed that today's public housing, which was built for self-reliant senior citizens, will become tomorrow's residence for the frail.

This study is intended to provide indication of the living situation facing senior citizen residents in public housing in Ontario. It focuses on the tenant groups experiencing difficulties with activities of daily living and their use of supports.

Study Design and Methodology

The sampling method employed a three stage random sampling process: the selection of municipalities for sampling, the selection of housing projects to be sampled within the municipalities, and the selection of senior tenants within the specified housing projects. The municipalities chosen were Belleville, London, Metropolitan Toronto, Owen Sound, Peterborough, St. Catharines and Sudbury.

The tenant survey involved contact with 596 senior citizen public housing tenants. The response rate on the tenant survey was 80.4 per cent, with 15.8 per cent refusing to be interviewed and 3.9 per cent contacted but not interviewed. This resulted in 479 personal interviews with senior citizen public housing tenants.

4.1 Summary of Findings From the Agency Survey

Objective 1: Description of the neighbourhoods where housing projects are located.

Most of the seniors' housing projects were located in lower and middle income residential neighbourhoods. Approximately one-third of the projects were situated in areas where predominantly other seniors lived.

Although transportation facilities were rated very highly (very good or excellent) by most service providers who responded to the survey, a number of other neighbourhood aspects were not rated as highly, including "safety from crime or violence, condition of housing, quality of air, amount of noise from traffic and parks and playgrounds".

Senior housing projects in the sample appeared to be very accessible in terms of walking distance or public transit, and facilities such as the corner store, restaurants, parks, drug stores, banks, shopping centres, churches and doctors' offices.

Objective 2: Description of the service providers' perceptions of the tenants' problems.

There was consensus among the service providers on the major problems faced by the senior tenants. According to the agency respondents, many seniors appeared to be without major problems. Of those experiencing problems, the list included isolation, inadequate income, poor physical health, not getting adequate meals, fear of crime, housekeeping problems and transportation problems.

Objective 3: Description of the service providers' perceptions of the services available to the tenants.

Although almost all respondents reported that services such as the public health nurse, Meals on Wheels and homemaking were available to tenants, the agency respondents seemed generally unaware of some of the other services or agencies that provide services to public housing tenants in their community. As many as half were not aware of whether some of the other services mentioned were available.

Objective 4: Description of the possible reasons why some tenants did not use the services they need.

There were a variety of reasons given by service providers as to their perceptions of why seniors in public housing did not use the services they needed. The two main reasons appeared to be "lack of information" and "lack of recognition of needs" on the part of the tenants themselves. "Client unawareness" as well as "lack of client motivation" were foremost in a list of problems that service providers reported having when dealing with tenants in public housing.

Objective 5: Description of the service providers' perceptions of their role in the housing projects.

The agency respondents perceived a need for improved communication between housing project staff and outside agencies;

tenants and service providers as a whole; and among agencies themselves. In exactly one-half of the housing projects for seniors, agency respondents reported never meeting with housing project staff regarding their service delivery. More than one-half said they never conferred with other agencies about their cases. In almost one-half of the projects, respondents felt that they did not find out about tenant problems until a crisis occurred.

Most of the service providers felt that an on-site, multi-service facility would improve service delivery to public housing tenants in their community.

4.2 Summary of Findings From the Tenant Survey

Objective 1: Description of senior citizen public housing tenants with respect to their background characteristics, health status and social networks.

The senior citizen public housing respondents tended to be mainly women living alone, within the 65 - 84 year old age group. Two-thirds of the senior housing tenants were born in Canada, with the remainder born predominantly in the United Kingdom, having immigrated to Canada before 1960. The principal sources of income for public housing seniors were government income security payments such as the old age security. The senior citizen housing tenants had incomes which were lower than the average income for elderly persons in Ontario.

While the majority of respondents in this study considered themselves to be in good or excellent health, over one-half indicated that health problems stood in the way of their doing the things they wanted to do. Health was not found to be related to age in this survey, perhaps reflecting an underreporting of health problems by the more elderly public housing respondents. On the average, the senior respondents reported 2.8 health problems, and about three-quarters of the respondents with health problems indicated that these problems interfered with their daily activities. The most frequent health problems reported were arthritis, high blood pressure or heart trouble or the effects of a stroke, and circulation trouble in the arms or legs. Just over one-quarter of the respondents indicated a hospital stay in the past year.

The majority of respondents indicated social contacts with children, other family, friends and neighbours. Less than five per cent of seniors had no social contacts. Contact with children, relatives and friends was fairly frequent, with telephoning as the most common source of contact. Visiting tended to be less frequent than telephone contact.

Objective 2: Description of the difficulties with the activities of daily living reported by senior citizen public housing tenants.

The average number of difficulties with activities of daily living reported by the senior citizen public housing respondents was 3.7. It is important to note that almost eighty-five per cent of respondents reported at least one difficulty. Over one-half of respondents reported difficulties going up and down stairs, grocery shopping and heavy cleaning. Two-fifths of respondents indicated difficulties cutting toenails, getting around the community, and doing light housework. One-fifth had difficulty doing laundry, bathing and preparing regular meals. Persons 85 years of age and older had more difficulty than those under the age of 85 doing light cleaning, doing laundry, banking and preparing bills, cutting toenails and getting around the community. (See Chapter 3, Section 3.2).

Objective 3: Description of the type of, frequency and arrangement for assistance received by senior citizen public housing tenants who were experiencing difficulties with the activities of daily living.

This section is limited only to respondents who reported difficulties with the activities of daily living.

A series of questions in the senior citizen public housing survey was designed to measure the extent to which those experiencing difficulties with the activities of daily living were receiving help and the extent to which they would like some help if they were not already receiving it. The findings indicate that, with the exception of those having difficulties with bathing, the majority of respondents with difficulties were receiving help. The percentage of tenants experiencing difficulty and receiving help did, however, vary by the type of difficulty. About ninety per cent of those having difficulties with grocery shopping and banking and preparing bills were receiving assistance. About seventy-five per cent of those experiencing difficulties doing laundry and heavy cleaning had help. The proportion of respondents receiving help for getting around the community, meal preparation and light housework was close to seventy per cent. About forty per cent of those who had difficulty bathing were receiving assistance.

The most frequent assistance received by the respondents in this survey was preparing regular meals and bathing (i.e. several times per week). Assistance with grocery shopping and/or laundry was received typically on a weekly or bi-weekly basis. Assistance with banking and preparing bills, light housework, getting around the community and heavy cleaning was received on an average of once or twice a month.

The length of time assistance was received varied across activities. One-half of the senior respondents who reported assistance with preparing regular meals or bathing had received help for less than six months. Approximately one-third of the respondents receiving help with light housework or laundry received assistance for about the same time. It is noteworthy that for grocery shopping, heavy cleaning, getting around the community and banking and preparing bills, about one-quarter of those receiving assistance had help for more than four years. Most of the seniors receiving assistance had help on a regular and on-going basis.

Arrangements for assistance tended to be made by the physicians for those activities provided by community health and social service agencies (i.e. homemaking, nursing and meal services). The seniors tended to make their own arrangements for the other activities.

Respondents were asked "in the past year have you or any family member ever received help from" various community services. The data showed that, on average, seniors or their family members used 1.7 services within the past year.

Seventy per cent of the senior respondents reported the use of at least one service within the past year. Many reported contact with multiple services. For example, about one-quarter of respondents used three or more services.

The most frequently used services were housing project staff, including building maintenance (24.2%), public health nurses or other nurses (21.3%), drop in centres (20.0%), homemaking services (14.2%), vision services (14.2%), footcare services (11.5%), physiotherapist (10.6%), meal services (9.2%), nutrition counselling (7.9%), dental services (6.9%), special transportation (6.5%), friendly visiting (6.1%) and day hospitals or clinics (5.2%).

While the overall number of services used did not vary by age, certain services were more likely to be used by the most elderly seniors than others. These were public health nurses or other nurses, homemaking services, meal services and friendly visiting.

Objective 4: Description of the sources of assistance used by public housing tenants with the activities of daily living and the differences in the sources used.

Support services may come from a diverse number of sources which, for purposes of this survey, have been classed as either informal supports (i.e. children, other family, friends or neighbours) or formal supports (i.e. community agency, hired services, church, club or organization etc.). The type of support received by senior respondents with difficulties in the activities of daily living in public housing in Ontario varies by activity.

Of all the assistane provided, children provided 29.3 per cent of the help; community agencies provided 19.6 per cent of the help; 18.2 per cent of the help was from paid sources; neighbours and/or friends provided 17.8 per cent of the help; family other than children provided 11.2 per cent of the help; and spouses provided 3.3 per cent of the help. Note that about two-thirds of all assistance received was provided by informal sources of support.

There were important variations in the sources of support across activities. On the one hand, assistance with bathing, light housework and preparing regular meals came mainly from formal sources of assistance. On the other hand, assistance with banking and preparing bills, getting around the community and laundry was provided largely by informal sources. Assistance for heavy cleaning came almost equally from both sources.

The type of support received for those having difficulties with or receiving help for the activities of daily living varied significantly by a number of the background characteristics including age, household status, years of education, birthplace and year of immigration, hospitalization and frequency of social contacts.

Respondents seventy-five years of age and older were more likely than those in the younger age category to be receiving help from formal services for heavy cleaning and light housework. Seniors eighty-five and older were more likely than the younger respondents to receive informal support for heavy cleaning.

The respondent's household status was related to the type of support they received. Respondents who lived alone were more likely to have received help from formal services than those who lived with others. And, those who lived with others were more likely to have received help from informal sources than those who lived alone. This relationship was found to be significant ($p < .05$) for seniors having difficulties with light housework, heavy cleaning and preparing regular meals.

The number of years of formal education attained by the respondents was statistically related to the type of support they received for two activities, namely, light housework and heavy cleaning. For these activities, the respondents with at least some high school were more likely to have help from formal sources of support, and less likely to have help from informal sources. The reverse was found to be true for those with less than a grade nine education.

Birthplace and year of immigration was also related to the type of support respondents received. Compared to senior respondents born in Canada, and more recent immigrants to Canada (i.e. 1950 or later), foreign born seniors who immigrated before

1950 were more likely to receive support from formal sources for light housework, and bathing. And, compared to the other two groups, foreign born immigrants to Canada in 1950 or later were more likely to have help from informal sources of support.

Monthly household income was not found to be associated with the type of support received for any of the eight activities of daily living analyzed. It should be noted, however, that there was very little range in the respondents' incomes.

Senior citizen public housing respondents who had been hospitalized during the past year were more likely than those who were not hospitalized to have formal support for light housework, preparing regular meals and bathing.

Seniors with more frequent social contacts were more likely to have help from informal sources for light housework and grocery shopping. There was very little variation in the percentage receiving support from formal sources when the frequency of social contacts was considered.

> Objective 5: To describe the extent to which senior citizen public housing tenants, who were experiencing difficulties with the activities of daily living, were receiving the help they indicated they needed.

The vast majority of respondents reported that the assistance they received was both "enough help" and "the right kind of help". Without the help they were currently receiving, about two-thirds of the respondents perceived they could get by only with a lot of difficulty or not at all.

The number of respondents who experienced difficulties and were not receiving assistance were:

59.8% of 97 respondents with difficulties bathing;

35.2% of 179 respondents with difficulties doing light housework;

33.7 % of 92 respondents with difficulties preparing regular meals;

28.8% of 183 respondents with difficulties getting around the community;

25.2% of 258 respondents with difficulties doing heavy cleaning;

20.2% of 99 respondents with difficulties doing laundry;

11.7% of 265 respondents with difficulties grocery shopping;

8.8% of 114 respondents with difficulties banking and preparing bills.

When the respondents who reported difficulties but no assistance were asked if they could use help, the areas of the greatest perceived need were light housework (15.6%), heavy cleaning (14.7%), preparing regular meals (16.3), bathing (12.4%) and getting around the community (12.0%).

Objective 6: To compare the senior citizen public housing tenants with the respondents from the United Senior Citizens of Ontario.

In 1981, the United Senior Citizens of Ontario in conjunction with the Ontario government and Federal government sponsored a study which sampled seniors in eight communities across the province on issues relating to their health, their abilities to carry out activities of daily living, types of assistance available to them and other related topics. The findings of the public housing study were compared with the USCO study.

The senior citizen public housing respondents were, on average, older, much more likely to be female, and to live alone than the respondents in the USCO survey. As well, on average, they had less formal education and their total monthly income was less than the seniors from the USCO sample.

Comparisons of the health status of seniors in public housing to respondents in the USCO sample indicate that, while there was very little difference in the subjective rating of health of both groups, there were important age differences when subjective health was considered. While the USCO results showed that younger persons rated their health as better than older persons, this difference by age was not found in the public housing sample. This finding may reflect a tendency on the part of elderly seniors in public housing to under-report health problems.

While the questions on the ability of respondents to carry out activities of daily living were not strictly comparable between the two studies, it appears that the public housing seniors were more likely to report difficulties with the activities of daily living, particularly in relation to bathing and preparing regular meals.

Finally, the use of assistance from formal sources appeared to be somewhat greater among seniors in public housing than among respondents in the USCO survey, specifically with respect to visiting nurses, homemakers/Home Care, meal services, and friendly visiting. While only three per cent of all assistance in the USCO survey was provided by formal sources of support, almost twenty per cent of assistance was derived from formal sources of support in the public housing survey.

REFERENCES

Atchley, R.C.
1980 *The Social Forces in Later Life.* Belmont, CA: Wadsworth Publishing Company.

Baltay, Maureen
1977 *Long-Term Care for the Elderly and Disabled.* Washington, D.C.: Congressional Budget Office.

Branch, L.G. and Jette, A.M.
1983 "Elders Use of Informal Long-Term Case Assistance". *The Gerontologist*, (Vol. 23, No. 1) pp. 51-56.

Metropolitan Toronto Housing Company
1981 *R.J. Smith Pilot Project to Provide Home Support Services to Tenants of Metropolitan Housing Company*. Toronto: Metropolitan Community Service Department.

Ontario
1980 *Demographic Transition in Ontario*.

Ontario
1982 *The Elderly in Ontario: An Agenda for the '80s*. Ontario Task Force on Aging

Ontario, Minister for Senior Citizens Affairs, Seniors Secretariat and the United Senior Citizens of Ontario
1985 a *Elderly in Ontario, An Overview*.

b *Elderly in Ontario: Age Differences with Particular Focus on Persons Aged 85+*.

c *Elderly Residents in Ontario: Their Health Status and the Use of the Health Care System*.

d *Elderly Residents in Ontario: Income Group Differences*.

e *Elderly Residents in Ontario: Social Contacts, Providers of Assistance and Requests for Additional Assistance*.

Ontario
1986 *A New Agenda: Health and Social Service Strategies for Ontario's Seniors.*

Ontario, Ministry of Community and Social Services
1980 *An Evaluation of VON Health Maintenance programs in Seniors' Housing*.

Ontario, Ministry of Health.
1982 *Report on the St. James Town Study: A Need Assessment of Senior Citizens*.

Ontario, Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing
1983 *Municipal Services to the Elderly*. Prepared by Linda Gray for the Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing.

Ontario Municipal Social Services Association
1984 *Direction For Seniors' Services: A Municipal Perspective*. Ontario Municipal Social Services Association Report.

Nusberg, C.
1984 *Innovative Aging Programs Abroad*. West Port Conn.: Greenwood Press.

Shannas, E., and Maddox, G.
1976 "Aging Health, and the Organization of Health Resources". In R. Binstock and E. Shannas (Eds.) *Handbook of Aging and the Social Services*. New York: Van Nostrand Reinhold.

Shannas, E.
1979 "The family as a social support system in old age". *The Gerontologist*, (19) pp. 169-174.

Victorian Order of Nurses for Canada
1982 *Directions for Seniors' Services, A Municipal Perspective.*

APPENDIX 1: A PROFILE OF THE USE OF COMMUNITY SERVICES BY SENIOR CITIZEN PUBLIC HOUSING RESPONDENTS: THE FREQUENCY OF ASSISTANCE; LENGTH OF TIME SERVICE WAS USED; DURATION OF ASSISTANCE AND WHETHER THE ASSISTANCE MET THE PERCEIVED NEED

APPENDIX 1: A PROFILE OF THE USE OF COMMUNITY SERVICES BY SENIOR CITIZEN PUBLIC HOUSING RESPONDENTS: THE FREQUENCY OF ASSISTANCE; LENGTH OF TIME SERVICE WAS USED; DURATION OF ASSISTANCE AND WHETHER THE ASSISTANCE MET THE PERCEIVED NEED

A.1.0 Introduction

There are many formal services available to the seniors and their families in public housing and, as seen in Chapter 3, a sizeable proportion of the respondents made use of these services. This appendix will profile those services which were used by more than five per cent of the seniors or their family members in public housing.

A.1.1 Public Health Nurse or Other Nurse

Over twenty per cent (21.3%, N = 102) of senior respondents had received the services of a public health or other nurse (e.g. V.O.N.) in the past year (see Table A.1.1). The most frequent service provided by the nurse was a blood pressure check (31.4%, N = 32), help with bathing or grooming (29.4%, N = 30), medical check ups (23.5%, N = 24), and post-surgery checks (12.7, N = 13). This assistance was mainly given in the respondent's home (80.4%, N = 82), although about twenty per cent (18.6%, N = 19) saw the nurse in a clinic held in the respondent's building or project.

Public health nurses tended to visit on a frequent basis, with the majority of respondents seeing the public health nurse once a week or more (56.9%, N = 58), and over sixteen per cent (16.7%, N = 17) as often as four times a week. Two-thirds (67.6%, N = 67) of the respondents received this service within the last year, with the largest per cent of respondents (43.4%, N = 43) having this service within the last six months. Of those receiving help from a nurse, almost one in five (17.1%, N = 17) had been getting this care for more than two years. Help tended to be on an on-going regular basis (48.5%, N = 49), although about one-third of the respondents were receiving care from a nurse for a limited period of time (35.6%, N = 36).

About ninety per cent of the respondents described the receipt of service from the public health nurse as "enough help"

(91.2%, N = 93) and "the right kind of help" (90.2%, N = 92). This care was mainly arranged through a physician (61.8%, N = 63) or a public health nurse (24.5%, N = 25). Without the receipt of service from a public health or other nurse, over one-quarter of those receiving care (28.4%, N = 29) would not have been "able to get by", and a further one-quarter (27.5%, N = 28) of these respondents would only be able to get by with "a lot of difficulty".

TABLE A.1.1

SENIOR CITIZEN PUBLIC HOUSING RESPONDENTS BY HELP FROM PUBLIC HEALTH NURSE OR OTHER NURSE

	N	%
(a) In the past year, have you or any family member ever received help from a public health nurse or other nurse (e.g. V.O.N.)?		
Yes	102	21.3
No	377	78.7
(b) What kind of help service was this?		
Blood pressure taken	32	31.4
Medical check up	24	23.5
Help with bathing and grooming (including toenails)	30	29.4
Post surgery check	13	12.7
Other	3	2.9
	Total N = 102	
(c) Where did you receive this help?		
In Unit	82	80.4
In Building/Project	19	18.6
Out of Building/Project	1	1.0
	Total N = 102	
(d) In the past year, how often did you receive this help?		
4 times a week or more	17	16.7
2 or 3 times a week	22	21.6
Once a week	19	18.6
1 to 3 times a month	28	27.5
Less than once a month	16	15.7
	Total N = 102	

TABLE A.1.1 (Continued)

	N	%
(e) How long would you estimate you received (or have been getting) this help?		
A few times only	5	5.1
Less than 6 months	43	43.4
6 months to one year	24	24.2
More than one to two years	10	10.1
More than two to three years	7	7.0
More than three to four years	2	2.0
Over four years	8	8.1
	Total	N = 99
(f) Was this help on going regular, on going occasional or time limited?		
Once	5	5.0
On-going, regular	49	48.5
On-going, occasional	11	10.9
Time limited	36	35.6
	Total	N = 101
(g) Did you receive enough help?		
Yes	93	91.2
No	9	8.8
	Total	N = 102
(h) Was it the right kind of help?		
Yes	92	90.2
No	10	9.8
	Total	N = 102
(i) How did you arrange for this help or service?		
Physician	63	61.8
Public Health Nurse	25	24.5
Myself	9	8.8
Community Group	3	2.9
Community Relation Workers	1	1.0
Hospital	1	1.0
	Total	N = 102
(j) Without help, would you have been able to get by?		
With no difficulty	24	23.5
A little difficulty	21	20.6
A lot of difficulty	28	27.5
Not at all	29	28.4
	Total	N = 102

A.1.2 Physical Therapist

One in ten (10.6%, N = 51) of the senior respondents received the services of a physical therapist in the past year (see Table A.1.2). Assistance came mainly in the form of exercises (54.9%, N = 28) or therapy for arthritis (11.8%, N = 6). Of those taking treatment, about one-half (49.0%, N = 25) received this service in their own home, and the other half (51.0%, N = 26) received this service outside of their housing project.

Three-quarters of respondents (76.5%, N = 39) were under the care of the physical therapist at least once a week. Two-thirds (68.6%, N = 35) of the respondents received this service for less than six months. Assistance from a physical therapist tended to be on a time-limited basis (62.7%, N = 32). One-quarter (27.4%, N = 14) of the respondents described their help as on-going and regular.

Ninety per cent of the seniors under the care of a physical therapist described this service as "enough help" (90.0%, N = 45) and "the right kind of help" (88.2%, N = 45). Care was arranged largely by a physician (90.2%, N = 46). Without the receipt of assistance from a physical therapist, twenty-nine per cent of the respondents receiving this service (29.4%, N = 15) would not have been "able to get by", and a further forty-five per cent of the respondents (45.1%, N = 23) would have been able to get by only with "a lot of difficulty".

TABLE A.1.2

SENIOR CITIZEN PUBLIC HOUSING RESPONDENTS BY HELP FROM PHYSICAL THERAPIST

	N	%
(a) In the past year, have you or any family member ever received help from a physical therapist?		
Yes	51	10.6
No	428	89.4
(b) What kind of help/service was this?		
Exercises	28	54.9
Arthritis Therapy	6	11.8
Other or Unspecified	17	33.3
	Total N = 51	
(c) Where did you receive this help?		
In Unit	25	49.0
Out of Building/Project	26	51.0
	Total N = 51	
(d) In the past year, how often did you receive this help?		
4 times a week or more	10	19.6
2 or 3 times a week	21	41.2
Once a week	8	15.7
1 to 3 times a month	2	3.9
Less than once a month	9	17.6
Other	1	2.0
	Total N = 51	
(e) How long would you estimate you received (or have been getting) this help?		
A few times only	8	15.7
Less than 6 months	35	68.6
6 months to one year	3	5.9
More than two to three years	1	2.0
More than three to four years	1	2.0
Over four years	3	5.9
	Total N = 51	

TABLE A.1.2 (Continued)

	N	%
(f) Was this help on going regular, on going occasional or time limited?		
Once	3	5.9
On-going, regular	14	27.4
On-going, occasional	2	3.9
Time limited	32	62.7
	Total N = 51	
(g) Did you receive enough help?		
Yes	45	90.0
No	5	10.0
	Total N = 50	
(h) Was it the right kind of help?		
Yes	45	88.2
No	6	11.8
	Total N = 51	
(i) How did you arrange for this help or service?		
Physician	46	90.2
Myself	2	3.9
Public Health Nurse	1	2.0
Community Group	1	2.0
Hospital	1	2.0
	Total N = 51	
(j) Without help, would you have been able to get by?		
With no difficulty	5	9.8
A little difficulty	8	15.7
A lot of difficulty	23	45.1
Not at all	15	29.4
	Total N = 51	

A.1.3 Homemaking Services

In the past year fourteen per cent (14.2%, N = 68) of the senior respondents had received the service of a homemaking or laundry service (see Table A.1.3). Help provided included light housecleaning (57.4%, N = 39), heavy housecleaning (22.1%, N = 15) preparation of meals (8.8%, N = 6) or help with laundry (7.4%, N = 5). The vast majority of this help (89.7%, N = 61) took place in the respondent's home.

The receipt of homemaking services was fairly frequent, with about seventy per cent (69.2%, N = 47) of respondents receiving this help once a week or more. One-half of the respondents (50.0%, N = 34) had been receiving this service for less than six months, although almost twenty per cent of the respondents (17.6%, N = 12) receiving homemaking services had been doing so for two years or longer. The receipt of homemaking services tended to be either on-going and regular (50.0%, N = 34) or on a time-limited basis (35.3%, N = 24).

Most respondents described the help received from homemaking or laundry services as both "enough help" (94.1%, N = 64) and the "right kind of help" (95.6%, N = 65). Homemaking or laundry services were arranged largely by a physician (46.3%, N = 31), or by another formal agency such as the public health nurse (10.4%, N = 7), or a community group (11.9%, N = 8). About one-quarter (22.4%, N = 15) of the respondents receiving homemaking or laundry services did so at their own initiative. Without this help, thirty-one per cent (31.3%, N = 21) of those respondents receiving homemaking or laundry services would not have been "able to get by" and almost forty per cent (38.8%, N = 26) would only have been able to get by with "a lot of difficulty".

TABLE A.1.3

SENIOR CITIZEN PUBLIC HOUSING RESPONDENTS BY HELP FROM HOMEMAKING SERVICES (INCLUDING LAUNDRY)

	N	%
(a) In the past year, have you or any family member ever received help from homemaking or laundry services?		
Yes	68	14.2
No	411	85.8
(b) What kind of help/service was this?		
Light housecleaning	39	57.4
Heavy housecleaning	15	22.1
Prepare meals	6	8.8
Send out laundry	5	7.4
Other	3	4.4
	Total N = 68	
(c) Where did you receive this help?		
In Unit	61	89.7
Out of Building/Project	7	10.3
	Total N = 68	
(d) In the past year, how often did you receive this help?		
4 times a week or more	7	10.3
2 or 3 times a week	22	32.4
Once a week	18	26.5
1 to 3 times a month	13	19.1
Less than once a month	4	5.9
Other	4	5.9
	Total N = 68	
(e) How long would you estimate you received (or have been getting) this help?		
A few times only	10	14.7
Less than 6 months	34	50.0
6 months to one year	10	14.7
More than one to two years	2	2.9
More than two to three years	4	5.9
More than three to four years	2	2.9
Over four years	6	8.8
	Total N = 68	

TABLE A.1.3 (Continued)

	N	%
(f) Was this help on going regular, on going occasional or time limited?		
Once	6	8.8
On-going, regular	34	50.0
On-going, occasional	4	5.9
Time limited	24	35.3
	Total N = 68	
(g) Did you receive enough help?		
Yes	64	94.1
No	4	5.9
	Total N = 68	
(h) Was it the right kind of help?		
Yes	65	95.6
No	3	4.4
	Total N = 68	
(i) How did you arrange for this help or service?		
Physician	31	46.3
Myself	15	22.4
Community Group	8	11.9
Public Health Nurse	7	10.4
Neighbour/Friend	3	4.5
Relatives	2	3.0
Hospital	1	1.5
	Total N = 67	
(j) Without help, would you have been able to get by?		
With no difficulty	8	11.9
A little difficulty	12	17.9
A lot of difficulty	26	38.8
Not at all	21	31.3
	Total N = 67	

A.1.4 Meal Services

One in ten (9.2%, N = 44) senior respondents in public housing had received meal services in the past year (see Table A.1.4). Meal services were given in the respondent's home (97.7%, N = 43) several times per week (i.e., fifty per cent [47.7%, N = 21] of respondents had a meal delivered four times a week or more). Although a few respondents had received meal services for over two years (13.6%, N = 6), over forty per cent (43.2%, N = 19) of these respondents had been receiving this help for less than six months. Meal services tended to be given on an on-going regular basis (45.5%, N = 20) or on a time-limited basis (36.4%, N = 16).

While most respondents receiving meal services described the receipt of this service as "enough help" (86.4%, N = 38) and the "right kind of help" (75.0%, N = 33), a few respondents did not feel that it was "enough help" (13.6%, N = 6) or the "right kind of help" (25.0%, N = 11). Meal services were arranged in a variety of ways. About forty per cent of respondents receiving meal services used formal sources to arrange for this service, such as a physician (29.5%, N = 13), or a public health nurse (9.1%, N = 4). One-half of the respondents either arranged this service themselves (36.4%, N = 16) or through a relative (15.9%, N = 7). Without meal services, eighteen per cent (18.2%, N = 8) of respondents receiving meal services would not have been "able to get by" and thirty per cent (29.5%, N = 13) would have been able to get by only with "a lot of difficulty".

TABLE A.1.4

SENIOR CITIZEN PUBLIC HOUSING RESPONDENTS BY HELP FROM MEAL SERVICES

	N	%
(a) In the past year, have you or any family member ever received help from a meal service?		
Yes	44	9.2
No	435	90.8
(b) Where did you receive this help?		
In Unit	43	97.7
In Building/Project	1	2.3
	Total N = 44	
(c) In the past year, how often did you receive this help?		
4 times a week or more	21	47.7
2 or 3 times a week	15	34.1
Once a week	2	4.5
Less than once a month	5	11.4
Other	1	2.3
	Total N = 44	
(d) How long would you estimate you received (or have been getting) this help?		
A few times only	7	15.9
Less than 6 months	19	43.2
6 months to one year	7	15.9
More than one to two years	5	11.4
More than two to three years	3	6.8
More than three to four years	2	4.5
Over four years	1	2.3
	Total N = 44	

TABLE A.1.4 (Continued)

(e) Was this help on going regular, on going occasional or time limited?	N	%
Once	5	11.4
On-going, regular	20	45.5
On-going, occasional	3	6.8
Time limited	16	36.4

Total N = 44

(f) Did you receive enough help?	N	%
Yes	38	86.4
No	6	13.6

Total N = 44

(g) Was it the right kind of help?	N	%
Yes	33	75.0
No	11	25.0

Total N = 44

(h) How did you arrange for this help or service?	N	%
Myself	16	36.4
Physican	13	29.5
Relatives	7	15.9
Public Health Nurse	4	9.1
Neighbour/Friend	1	2.3
Community Relation Workers	1	2.3
Community Group	1	2.3
Residential Council	1	2.3

Total N = 44

(i) Without help, would you have been able to get by?	N	%
With no difficulty	11	25.0
A little difficulty	12	27.3
A lot of difficulty	13	29.5
Not at all	8	18.2

Total N = 44

A.1.5 Footcare Services

Footcare services had been used by over ten per cent (11.5%, N = 55) of senior respondents in public housing in Ontario in the last year (see Table A.1.5). These services provided help with cutting toenails (63.6%, N = 35) or care from a foot specialist (29.1%, N = 16). Assistance was received primarily outside of the respondent's home, in a clinic in the housing project (14.5%, N = 8) or outside the housing project (54.5%, N = 30). About one-third (30.9%, N = 17) of respondents had footcare services in their own home.

The receipt of footcare services took place less than once a month for three-quarters of the respondents. (70.4%, N = 38), although about one-quarter (25.9%, N = 14) of the seniors received help from one to three times per month. The length of time respondents had received footcare services varied. About half (46.3%, N = 24) of the seniors had received footcare services for less than one year. This service tended to be on-going and regular (67.3%, N = 37).

The vast majority of those receiving footcare services described the services as "enough help" (96.4%, N = 53) and the "right kind of help" (94.5%, N = 52). Footcare services were arranged through a variety of informal and formal sources. Forty-two per cent (42.6%, N = 23) arranged for this service themselves; twenty-two per cent (22.2%, N = 12) had footcare services arranged through a physician; fifteen per cent (14.8%, N = 8) had this service arranged through a public health nurse; and the other nine per cent had a community group arrange for this service (9.3%, N = 5). Without this service, almost two in five (38.9%, N = 21) of respondents receiving footcare services indicated they would not have been able to get by, and a further two in five (37.0%, N = 20) would only have been able to get by with "a lot of difficulty".

TABLE A.1.5

SENIOR CITIZEN PUBLIC HOUSING RESPONDENTS BY HELP FROM FOOTCARE SERVICES

	N	%
(a) In the past year, have you or any family member ever received help from a footcare service?		
Yes	55	11.5
No	424	88.5
(b) What kind of help/service was this?		
Toenails cut	35	63.6
Foot Specialist	16	29.1
Other	4	7.3
	Total N = 55	
(c) Where did you receive this help?		
In Unit	17	30.9
In Building/Project	8	14.5
Out of Building/Project	30	54.5
	Total N = 55	
(d) In the past year, how often did you receive this help?		
Once a week	2	3.7
1 to 3 times a month	14	25.9
Less than once a month	38	70.4
	Total N = 54	
(e) How long would you estimate you received (or have been getting) this help?		
A few times only	9	16.7
Less than 6 months	4	7.4
6 months to one year	12	22.2
More than one to two years	10	18.5
More than two to three years	5	9.3
More than three to four years	3	5.6
Over four years	11	20.4
	Total N = 54	

TABLE A.1.5 (Continued)

	N	%
(f) Was this help on going regular, on going occasional or time limited?		
Once	10	18.2
On-going, regular	37	67.3
On-going, occasional	6	10.9
Time limited	2	3.6
	Total N = 55	
(g) Did you receive enough help?		
Yes	53	96.4
No	2	3.6
	Total N = 55	
(h) Was it the right kind of help?		
Yes	52	94.5
No	3	5.5
	Total N = 55	
(i) How did you arrange for this help or service?		
Myself	23	42.6
Physician	12	22.2
Public Health Nurse	8	14.8
Neighbour/Friend	5	9.3
Community Group	5	9.3
Ad or Sign	1	1.9
	Total N = 54	
(j) Without help, would you have been able to get by?		
With no difficulty	5	9.3
A little difficulty	8	14.8
A lot of difficulty	20	37.0
Not at all	21	38.9
	Total N = 54	

A.1.6 Vision Services

In the past year fourteen per cent (14.0%, N = 67) of respondents or their family members received the vision services (see Table A.1.6). This service consisted of a visit to an opthomologist (57.6%, N = 38) an eye check or new glasses (24.2%, N = 16) or eye surgery (18.2%, N = 12). This help took place outside the respondent's home or project, and tended to be less than once a month (92.4%, N = 61). While about one-third (34.8%, N = 23) of respondents had the service a few times only, many had been receiving this help for an extended period of time. For example, thirty per cent (30.3%, N = 20) of respondents had received vision services for over four years. Although many of the seniors had received help only once in the past year (34.3%, N = 23), over one-half (53.7%, N = 36) of the respondents were receiving this service on an on-going regular basis.

Vision services were described by most respondents as "enough help" (94.0%, N = 63) and "the right kind of help" (93.9%, N = 62). Vision services were arranged either by the respondent themselves (47.8%, N = 32) or through a physician (41.8%, N = 28). Without vision services, about one-third (28.8%, N = 19) of respondents receiving this service indicated they would not have been "able to get by", and a further one-third (30.3%, N = 20) of these respondents indicated they would have been able to get by only with "a lot of difficulty".

TABLE A.1.6

SENIOR CITIZEN PUBLIC HOUSING RESPONDENTS BY HELP FROM VISION SERVICES

	N	%
(a) In the past year, have you or any family member ever received help from a vision service?		
Yes	67	14.0
No	412	86.0
(b) What kind of help/service was this?		
Opthomologist	38	57.6
Eyes checked or new glasses	16	24.2
Eye surgery	12	18.2
	Total N = 66	
(c) Where did you receive this help?		
Out of Building/Project	67	100.0
	Total N = 67	
(d) In the past year, how often did you receive this help?		
1 to 3 times a month	3	4.5
Less than once a month	61	92.4
Other	2	3.0
	Total N = 66	
(e) How long would you estimate you received (or have been getting) this help?		
A few times only	23	34.8
Less than 6 months	4	6.1
6 months to one year	6	9.1
More than one to two years	5	7.6
More than two to three years	5	7.6
More than three to four years	3	4.5
Over four years	20	30.3
	Total N = 66	

TABLE A.1.6 (Continued)

	N	%
(f) Was this help on going regular, on going occasional or time limited?		
Once	23	34.3
On-going, regular	36	53.7
On-going, occasional	3	4.5
Time limited	5	7.5
	Total N = 67	
(g) Did you receive enough help?		
Yes	63	94.0
No	4	6.0
	Total N = 67	
(h) Was it the right kind of help?		
Yes	62	93.9
No	4	6.1
	Total N = 66	
(i) How did you arrange for this help or service?		
Myself	32	47.8
Physician	28	41.8
Relatives	3	4.5
Veterans Affairs	2	3.0
Neighbour/Friend	1	1.5
Community Group	1	1.5
	Total N = 67	
(j) Without help, would you have been able to get by?		
With no difficulty	12	18.2
A little difficulty	15	22.7
A lot of difficulty	20	30.3
Not at all	19	28.8
	Total N = 66	

A.1.7 Dental Services

In the past year, about seven per cent of respondents or their family members received help from dental services (see Table A.1.7). This consisted mainly of routine dental care (78.8%, N = 26) or dentures (21.2%, N = 7). Respondents received this service outside of their building or housing project (97.0%, N = 32).

The length of time respondents received dental services varied. About one-third of the respondents used dental services a few times only (34.4%, N = 11), one-fourth of the respondents (25.0%, N = 8) used these services for over four years. For a third (33.3%, N = 11) of respondents receiving dental services, the receipt of this service was on a time-limited basis, and for another third (36.4%, N = 12) dental treatment was on an on-going, regular basis.

Most respondents described the dental service they received as providing "enough help" (90.9%, N = 30) and the "right kind of help" (97.0%, N = 32). This service was mainly arranged by the respondents themselves (63.6%, N = 21). Without dental services, twenty-seven per cent (27.3%, N = 9) of respondents using these services indicated they would not have been "able to get by", and a further thirty-six per cent (36.4%, N = 12) indicated they would only have been able to get by with a "lot of difficulty".

TABLE A.1.7

SENIOR CITIZEN PUBLIC HOUSING RESPONDENTS BY HELP DENTAL SERVICES

	N	%
(a) In the past year, have you or any family member ever received help from a dental service?		
Yes	33	6.9
No	446	93.1
(b) What kind of help/service was this?		
Dental Care	26	78.8
Dentures	7	21.2
	Total N = 33	
(c) Where did you receive this help?		
In Unit	1	3.0
Out of Building/Project	32	97.0
	Total N = 33	
(d) In the past year, how often did you receive this help?		
4 times a week or more	1	3.0
Once a week	1	3.0
1 to 3 times a month	4	12.1
Less than once a month	27	81.8
	Total N = 33	
(e) How long would you estimate you received (or have been getting) this help?		
A few times only	11	34.4
Less than 6 months	4	12.5
6 months to one year	6	18.8
More than one to two years	2	6.3
More than two to three years	1	3.1
Over four years	8	25.0
	Total N = 32	

TABLE A.1.7 (Continued)

	N	%
(f) Was this help on going regular, on going occasional or time limited?		
Once	4	12.1
On-going, regular	12	36.4
On-going, occasional	6	18.2
Time limited	11	33.3
	Total N = 33	
(g) Did you receive enough help?		
Yes	30	90.9
No	3	9.1
	Total N = 33	
(h) Was it the right kind of help?		
Yes	32	97.0
No	1	3.0
	Total N = 33	
(i) How did you arrange for this help or service?		
Myself	21	63.6
Neighbour/Friend	3	9.1
Relatives	2	6.1
Physician	2	6.1
Community Group	2	6.1
Veterans Affairs	2	6.1
Other	1	3.0
	Total N = 33	
(j) Without help, would you have been able to get by?		
With no difficulty	2	6.1
A little difficulty	10	30.3
A lot of difficulty	12	36.4
Not at all	9	27.3
	Total N = 33	

A.1.8 Day Hospitals/Clinics

Slightly over five per cent (5.2%, N = 25) of the senior respondents had received the services of a day hospital or clinic in the past year (see Table A.1.8). This service involves visits to a cancer clinic (32.0%, N = 8), out patient clinic (20.0%, N = 5) or a visit to the hospital for tests (48.0%, N = 12). Services were frequently provided for less than once a month (60.0%, N = 15). The length of time respondents had received the services varied from a few times only (20.0%, N = 5) to over four years (8.0%, N = 2).

About ninety per cent described the services they received as "enough help" (88.0%, N = 22) and the "right kind of help" (91.7%, N = 22). Visits to a day hospital/clinic were largely arranged by a physician (76.0%, N = 19). Without this assistance, twenty-nine per cent (29.2%, N = 7) of respondents indicated they would not have been "able to get by" and a further forty-two per cent (41.7%, N = 10) stated they would only have been able to get by with "a lot of difficulty".

TABLE A.1.8

SENIOR CITIZEN PUBLIC HOUSING RESPONDENTS BY HELP FROM DAY HOSPITALS

	N	%
(a) In the past year, have you or any family member ever received help from a day hospital?		
Yes	25	5.2
No	454	94.8
(b) What kind of help/service was this?		
Cancer clinic	8	32.0
Out patient	5	20.0
Other	12	48.8
	Total N = 25	
(c) Where did you receive this help?		
Out of Building/Project	25	100.0
	Total N = 25	
(d) In the past year, how often did you receive this help?		
4 times a week or more	3	12.0
Once a week	1	4.0
1 to 3 times a month	6	24.1
Less than once a month	15	60.0
	Total N = 25	
(e) How long would you estimate you received (or have been getting) this help?		
A few times only	5	20.0
Less than 6 months	4	16.0
6 months to one year	5	20.0
More than one to two years	4	16.0
More than two to three years	1	4.0
More than three to four years	4	16.0
Over four years	2	8.0
	Total N = 25	

TABLE A.1.8 (Continued)

	N	%
(f) Was this help on going regular, on going occasional or time limited?		
Once	5	20.0
On-going, regular	10	40.0
On-going, occasional	5	20.0
Time limited	5	20.0
	Total N = 25	
(g) Did you receive enough help?		
Yes	22	88.0
No	3	12.0
	Total N = 25	
(h) Was it the right kind of help?		
Yes	22	91.7
No	2	8.3
	Total N = 24	
(i) How did you arrange for this help or service?		
Physician	19	76.0
Myself	3	12.0
Relatives	2	8.0
Community Group	1	4.0
	Total N = 25	
(j) Without help, would you have been able to get by?		
With no difficulty	3	12.5
A little difficulty	4	16.7
A lot of difficulty	10	41.7
Not at all	7	29.2
	Total N = 24	

A.1.9 Nutrition Counselling

Almost eight per cent (7.9%, N = 38) of the senior respondents had received services from a nutrition counsellor in the past year (see Table A.1.9). This service consisted of counselling on diets (65.8%, N = 25) and special counselling for diabetics (34.2%, N = 13). The services were generally received outside the respondent's housing project (73.7%, N = 28), although about one-quarter of respondents (23.7%, N = 9) were counselled in their own homes.

While about one-half (52.6%, N = 20) of those receiving counselling on nutrition did so less often than once a month, about one-quarter of the respondents (26.3%, N = 10) were counselled as often as once a week. The vast majority of seniors had received this service only during the last twelve months. Nutrition counselling tended to be on a time-limited (39.5%, N = 15) basis or a one time event (26.3%, N = 10).

Most respondents who received nutrition counselling indicated that they received "enough help" (94.7%, N = 36) and the "right kind of help" (94.7%, N = 36). In most cases, nutrition counselling was arranged through a physician (86.5%, N = 32). Without this service, sixteen per cent (16.2%, N = 6) of those receiving nutrition counselling indicated they would not have been "able to get by", and a further thirty per cent of respondents (29.7%, N = 11) stated they would only have been able to get by with "a lot of difficulty".

TABLE A.1.9

SENIOR CITIZEN PUBLIC HOUSING RESPONDENTS BY HELP FROM NUTRITION COUNSELLING

	N	%
(a) In the past year, have you or any family member ever received help from nutrition counsellor?		
Yes	38	7.9
No	441	92.1
(b) What Kind of help/service was this?		
Dietary counselling	25	65.8
Diabetic counselling	13	34.2
	Total N = 38	
(c) Where did you receive this help?		
In Unit	9	23.7
In Building/Project	1	2.6
Out of Building/Project	28	73.7
	Total N = 38	
(d) In the past year, how often did you receive this help?		
2 or 3 times a week	2	5.3
Once a week	10	26.3
1 to 3 times a month	6	15.8
Less than once a month	20	52.6
	Total N = 38	
(e) How long would you estimate you received (or have been getting) this help?		
A few times only	14	36.8
Less than 6 months	7	18.4
6 months to one year	8	21.1
More than one to two years	3	7.9
More than three to four years	1	2.6
Over four years	5	13.2
	Total N = 38	

TABLE A.1.9 (Continued)

	N	%
(f) Was this help on going regular, on going occasional or time limited?		
Once	10	26.3
On-going, regular	10	26.3
On-going, occasional	3	7.9
Time limited	15	39.5
	Total N = 38	
(g) Did you receive enough help?		
Yes	36	94.7
No	2	5.3
	Total N = 38	
(h) Was it the right kind of help?		
Yes	36	94.7
No	2	5.3
	Total N = 38	
(i) How did you arrange for this help or service?		
Physician	32	86.5
Myself	3	8.1
Public Health Nurse	1	2.7
Community Group	1	2.7
	Total N = 37	
(j) Without help, would you have been able to get by?		
With no difficulty	12	32.4
A little difficulty	8	21.6
A lot of difficulty	11	29.7
Not at all	6	16.2
	Total N = 37	

A.1.10 Friendly Visiting

In the past year, six per cent (6.1%, N = 29) of senior respondents received help from friendly visiting services in their homes (see Table A.1.10). Almost sixty per cent (58.6%, N = 17) of these visits were from clergy to provide a church service for the senior. Friendly visiting occurred less often than once a month (71.4%, N = 20). The length of time respondents received this service varied from a few times only (15.4%, N = 4) to over four years (26.9%, N = 7). Friendly visiting tended to be either on-going regular (48.3%, N = 14) or on-going occasional (41.4%, N = 12).

Most respondents described the visiting they received as "enough help" (89.3%, N = 25) and the "right kind of help" (92.6%, N = 25). Friendly visiting was usually arranged either by the respondent themselves (41.4%, N = 12) or through a church (34.5%, N = 10) or community group (10.3%, N = 3).

TABLE A.1.10

SENIOR CITIZEN PUBLIC HOUSING RESPONDENTS BY HELP FROM FRIENDLY VISITING

	N	%
(a) In the past year, have you or any family member ever received help from friendly visiting?		
Yes	29	6.1
No	450	93.9
(b) What kind of help/service was this?		
Clergy visit	17	58.6
Other visits	12	41.4
Total N =	29	
(c) Where did you receive this help?		
In the Home	27	93.1
Out of Building/Project	2	6.9
Total N =	29	
(d) In the past year, how often did you receive this help?		
Once a week	2	7.1
1 to 3 times a month	6	21.4
Less than once a month	20	71.4
Total N =	28	
(e) How long would you estimate you received (or have been getting) this help?		
A few times only	4	15.4
Less than 6 months	1	3.8
6 months to one year	9	34.6
More than one and up to two years	4	15.4
More than two and up to three years	1	3.8
Over four years	7	26.9
Total N =	26	

TABLE A. 1.10 (Continued)

	N	%
(f) Was this help on-going regular, on-going occasional or time limited?		
Once	1	3.4
On-going, regular	14	48.3
On-going, occasional	12	41.4
Time limited	2	6.9
Total N =	29	
(g) Did you receive enough help?		
Yes	25	89.3
No	3	10.7
Total N =	28	
(h) Was it the right kind of help?		
Yes	25	92.6
No	2	7.4
Total N =	27	
(i) How did you arrange for this help or service?		
Myself	12	41.4
Church	10	34.5
Community group	3	10.3
Physician	2	6.9
Neighbour/Friend	1	3.4
Veterans affairs	1	3.4
Total N =	29	
(j) Without help, would you have been able to get by?		
With no difficulty	16	55.2
A little difficulty	5	17.2
A lot of difficulty	7	24.1
Not at all	1	3.4
Total N =	29	

A.1.11 Special Transportation

Six per cent (6.5%, N = 31) of the respondents or their family members had used special transportation services in the past year (see Table A.1.11). While thirty per cent (29.0%, N = 9) received this service about once a week, special transportation was generally used less often than this.

The length of time respondents used special transportation varied from a few months (16.1%, N = 5) to over four years (19.4%, N = 6). Sixty per cent of respondents used special transportation on an on-going regular basis (58.1%, N = 18).

Respondents who used this service described it as "enough help" (87.1%, N = 27) and "the right kind of help" (93.5%, N = 29). Special transportation was arranged through a variety of sources, including the respondents themselves (41.9%, N = 13), a community group (19.4%, N = 6), a neighbour or friend (9.7%, N = 3), or a physician (9.7%, N = 3). Without this service, thirty-two per cent (32.3%, N = 10) of those using special transportation indicated they would not have been "able to get by", and another forty-two per cent (41.9%, N = 13) stated that they would have been able to get by with "a lot of difficulty".

TABLE A.1.11

SENIOR CITIZEN PUBLIC HOUSING RESPONDENTS BY HELP FROM SPECIAL TRANSPORTATION

	N	%
(a) In the past year, have you or any family member ever received help from special transportation?		
Yes	31	6.5
No	448	93.5
(b) What kind of help/service was this?		
Paratransit	9	29.0
Transportation to Shopping	5	16.0
Kiwanis bus	5	16.0
About town transportation	5	16.0
Other transportation	7	22.6
Total N =	31	
(c) Where did you receive this help?		
In the Home	5	16.7
In Building/Project	2	6.7
Out of Building/Project	23	76.7
Total N =	31	
(d) In the past year, how often did you receive this help?		
4 times a week or more	1	3.2
2 or 3 times a week	2	6.5
Once a week	9	29.0
1 to 3 times a month	8	25.8
Less than once a month	11	35.5
Total N =	31	

TABLE A.1.11 (Continued)

	N	%
(e) How long would you estimate you received (or have been getting) this help?		
A few times only	2	6.5
Less than 6 months	5	16.1
6 months to one year	3	9.7
More than one and up to two years	7	22.6
More than two and up to three years	7	22.6
More than three and up to four years	1	3.2
Over four years	6	19.4
Total N =	31	
(f) Was this help on-going regular, on-going occasional or time limited?		
Once	3	9.7
On-going, regular	18	58.1
On-going, occasional	7	22.6
Time limited	3	9.7
Total N =	31	
(g) Did you receive enough help?		
Yes	27	87.1
No	4	12.9
Total N =	31	
(h) Was it the right kind of help?		
Yes	29	93.5
No	2	6.5
Total N =	31	

TABLE A. 1.11 (Continued)

	N	%
(i) How did you arrange for this help or service?		
Myself	13	41.9
Community group	6	19.4
Neighbour/Friend	3	9.7
Physician	3	9.7
Veterans affairs	2	6.5
Relatives	1	3.2
Hospital	1	3.2
Residential Council	1	3.2
Church	1	3.2
Total N =	31	
(j) Without help, would you have been able to get by?		
With no difficulty	1	3.2
A little difficulty	7	22.6
A lot of difficulty	13	41.9
Not at all	10	32.3
Total N =	31	

A.1.12 Housing Project Staff

In the past year, almost one-quarter of the senior respondents or their family members received the services of housing project staff (see Table A.1.12). The major reason this service was sought was for needed repairs (81.9%, N = 95). This service was provided mainly in the respondent's homes (88.7%, N = 102) and generally occurred less than once a month (91.3%, N = 105). While one-half of the respondents used this service only within the past year (49.1%, N = 56), another third (36.8%, N = 42) had been receiving help from housing project staff for over four years. About one-quarter (23.5%, N = 27) of the seniors received this service only once in the past year; over half (55.7%, N = 64) described the receipt of this service as on-going occasional.

Over ninety per cent indicated that the service they received was "enough help" (92.2%, N = 106) and the "right kind of help" (90.4%, N = 104). Use of this service was largely initiated by the respondent (81.9%, N = 95), although in some cases it was arranged by the housing project staff, such as the CRW (7.8%, N = 9), the superintendent (3.4%, N = 4) or the residential council (5.2%, N = 6). Without this help, sixteen per cent (15.7%, N = 18) indicated they would not have been "able to get by", and a further thirty-eight per cent (38.3%, N = 44) indicated they would only have been able to get by with "a lot of difficulty".

TABLE A. 1.12

SENIOR CITIZEN PUBLIC HOUSING RESPONDENTS BY HELP FROM HOUSING PROJECT STAFF

	N	%
(a) In the past year, have you or any family member ever received help from housing project staff?		
Yes	116	24.2
No	363	75.8
(b) What kind of help/service was this?		
Repairs and maintenence	95	81.9
Interview with community relations worker	9	7.8
Other	12	10.8
Total N =	116	
(c) Where did you receive this help?		
In the Home	102	88.7
In Building/Project	6	2.6
Out of Building/Project	7	6.1
Total N =	115	
(d) In the past year, how often did you receive this help?		
Once a week	2	1.7
1 to 3 times a month	3	2.6
Less than once a month	105	91.3
Other	5	4.3
Total N =	115	
(e) How long would you estimate you received (or have been getting) this help?		
A few times only	37	32.5
Less than 6 months	5	4.4
6 months to one year	14	12.3
More than one and up to two years	5	4.4
More than two and up to three years	4	3.5
More than three and up to four years	7	6.1
Over four years	42	36.8
Total N =	114	

TABLE A. 1.12 (Continued)

	N	%
(f) Was this help on-going regular, on-going occasional or time limited?		
Once	27	23.5
On-going, regular	12	10.4
On-going, occasional	64	55.7
Time limited	12	10.4
Total N =	115	
(g) Did you receive enough help?		
Yes	106	92.2
No	9	7.8
Total N =	115	
(h) Was it the right kind of help?		
Yes	104	90.4
No	11	9.6
Total N =	115	
(i) How did you arrange for this help or service?		
Myself	95	81.9
Community relations worker	9	7.8
Residential Council	6	5.2
Superintendent	4	3.4
Relatives	1	0.9
Public health nurse	1	0.9
Total N =	116	
(j) Without help, would you have been able to get by?		
With no difficulty	17	14.8
A little difficulty	36	31.3
A lot of difficulty	44	38.3
Not at all	18	15.7
Total N =	115	

A.1.13 Drop-In Centres

In the past year, one in five (20.0%, N = 96) senior respondents made use of a drop-in centre, where they generally attended a club meeting (70.8%, N=68), or went to bingo, bowling or swimming (20.8%, N = 20) (see Table A.1.13). About half (50.0%, N = 48) of the drop-in centres were in the resident's building or housing project itself. The frequency of visits to the drop-in centre varied somewhat among the seniors. Over one-half (51.0%, N = 49) of those attending did so at least once a week, while about one-quarter (22.9%, N = 22) went less than once a month. Many of the senior respondents had been attending drop-in centres for an extended period of time. For example, fifty-five per cent (55.2%, N = 53) of the respondents had been visiting a drop-in centre for over four years. Attendance at a drop-in centre tended to be on-going and regular for most of the seniors (74.0%, N = 71).

The vast majority of respondents described the help received from this centre as "enough help" (93.5%, N = 87) and "the right kind of help" (94.6%, N = 88). Arrangements for attending a drop-in centre were largely made either by the respondents themselves (44.8%, N = 43) or through a residential council (31.3%, N = 30). About sixteen per cent (16.6%, N = 16) felt that without help from a drop-in centre they would have had "a lot of difficulty" in getting by.

TABLE A.1.13

SENIOR CITIZEN PUBLIC HOUSING RESPONDENTS BY HELP FROM DROP IN CENTRES

	N	%
(a) In the past year, have you or any family member ever received help from a drop in centre?		
Yes	96	20.0
No	383	80.0
(b) What kind of help/service was this?		
Clubs and meetings	68	70.8
Bingo, swimming, bowling	20	20.8
Other entertainment	8	8.4
Total N =	96	
(c) Where did you receive this help?		
In the Home	3	3.1
In the Building/Project	48	50.0
Out of Building/Project	45	46.9
Total N =	96	
(d) In the past year, how often did you receive this help?		
4 times a week or more	7	7.3
2 or 3 times a week	25	26.0
Once a week	17	17.7
1 to 3 times a month	25	26.0
Less than once a month	22	22.9
Total N =	96	
(e) How long would you estimate you received (or have been getting) this help?		
A few times only	5	5.2
Less than 6 months	6	6.3
6 months to one year	9	9.4
More than one and up to two years	6	6.3
More than two and up to three years	10	10.4
More than three and up to four years	7	7.3
Over four years	53	55.2
Total N =	96	

TABLE A.1.13 (Continued)

	N	%
(f) Was this help on-going regular. on-going occasional or time limited?		
Once	2	2.1
On-going, regular	71	74.0
On-going, occasional	18	18.8
Time limited	5	5.2
Total N =	96	
(g) Did you receive enough help?		
Yes	87	93.5
No	6	6.5
Total N =	93	
(h) Was it the right kind of help?		
Yes	88	94.6
No	5	5.4
Total N =	93	
(i) How did you arrange for this help or service?		
Myself	43	44.8
Residential council	30	31.3
Neighbour/Friend	8	8.3
Community group	6	6.3
Church	3	3.1
Ad or Sign	2	2.1
Relatives	2	2.1
Public health nurse	1	1.0
Physician	1	1.0
Total N =	96	
(j) Without help, would you have been able to get by?		
With no difficulty	63	65.6
A little difficulty	17	17.7
A lot of difficulty	15	15.6
Not at all	1	1.0
Total N =	96	

APPENDIX 2: METHODOLOGY TABLES FOR THE AGENCY SURVEY

TABLE A.2.1

Final Response Rates for the Support Service Providers Survey

Municipalities	Number of Agencies/ Services Contacted	Response Rates (N)	Response Rates %	Number of Completed Questionnaires* (N)	Number of Completed Questionnaires* %
Toronto	50	(41)	82.0	(55)	50.5
Sudbury	22	(17)	77.3	(28)	21.2
Peterborough	23	(17)	73.9	(25)	27.2
Belleville	13	(9)	69.2	(16)	30.8
St. Catharines	13	(9)	69.2	(22)	42.3
London	34	(22)	64.7	(57)	18.6
Owen Sound	18	(11)	61.1	(21)	29.2
Total	173	(126)		(224)	

* Each respondent was asked to complete a questionnaire for each sampled housing project in their jurisdiction there are therefore more responses than respondents

TABLE A.2.2

Types of Respondents
Grouped According to Job Title

Job Title	(N)	%
Community Relations Worker	(78)	34.8
Public Health Nurse	(39)	17.4
Executive Director, Director Assistant Director and Administrator	(19)	8.5
Police Official	(17)	7.6
Supervisor/Senior Co-ordinator	(14)	6.3
Income Maintenence Officer	(12)	5.4
Manager	(9)	4.0
Chairperson	(6)	2.7
Project Officer	(6)	2.7
Salvation Army Officer	(5)	2.2
Senior Counsellor	(3)	1.3
All Others: Board Member, Credit Counsellor, Team Leader, Staff Lawyer, Specialist, Etc.	(9)	4.0
Title Not Given	(7)	3.1
Total	(224)	100.0

A.2.3

Phase One Mailing List for Survey of Support Service Providers

Belleville

Big Brothers Association

Big Sisters Association

Childrens' Aid Society

Community and Social Services

Community Relations Worker

Department of Social Services

Police Department

Salvation Army

United Community Services

London

Big Brothers

Big Sisters

Canadian Red Cross

Central Volunteer Bureau

Committee for Children and Youth

Community and Social Services

Community Relations Workers

Family and Childrens' Services

Family Centre/Mission Services

Family Consultant Service (London Police Department)

Family Counselling Centre

Information London

Salvation Army

Seniors Bureau

Social Services Division

Unemployment Help Centre

Owen Sound

Big Brothers

Big Sisters

Bruce County Social Services

Canadian Red Cross

Childrens' Aid Society

Community and Social Services

Community Relations Workers

Grey/Owen Sound Social and Family Services

Salvation Army

Peterborough

Big Brothers and Big Sisters

Canadian Red Cross

Childrens' Aid Society

Childrens' Liason Committee

Community Relations Workers

Family Counselling Service

Family Resource Centre

Home Care Program - Peterborough Health Unit

Meals on Wheels

Ontario Ministry of Social Services

Peterborough Health Unit

Peterborough Information Centre

Police Department

Salvation Army

Senior Citizens' Council

Senior Citizens' Information Bureau

Seniors' Counselling Service

Social Planning Council

United Citizens' Organization

Volunteer Bureau

St. Catharines

Big Brothers and Big Sisters

Community Relations Workers

Family & Childrens' Services

Health Services Department

Salvation Army Family Services

Social Planning Council

Social Services Department

Sudbury

Canadian Red Cross

Childrens' Aid Society

Childrens' Services Advisory Group

Community and Social Services

Manitoulin-Sudbury District Health Council

Ontario Legal Aid Plan

Ontario Provincial Police

Salvation Army

Social Services Administrative Board

Sudbury and District Health Unit

Metro

Community Relations Workers for the Sampled Housing Units

A.2.4

Phase Two Mailing List for Survey of Support Service Providers

Belleville

Bellville General Hospital (Home Care Patient Referral)

Hastings & Prince Edward Counties Health Unit

Red Cross Homemaking Services

Victorian Order of Nurses (Home Nursing Services)

London

Canadian Red Cross Society/Meals on Wheels

Community and Social Services

Community Home Support Program

Friendship in Action

Legal Aid Plan

Lord Elgin Public School

Middlesex London District Health Unit

Victorian Order of Nurses

Owen Sound

Bruce Grey Childrens' Services

Grey County & Owen Sound Health Services

Home Care Services

Meals on Wheels

Owen Sound Day Nursery

Owen Sound Police Depatment

Victorian Order of Nurses

The Womens' Centre

Peterborough

Activity Haven

Victorian Order of Nurses

St. Catharines

Associated Services

Chief of Police

Information Niagara

Meals on Wheels

Senior Citizens' Recreation Centre

Sudbury

Canada Employment Centre

La Service Familial de la Region de Sudbury, Inc.

Meals on Wheels

New Horizons - Department of National Health and Welfare

Senior Citizens' Association

Senior Citizens' Club

Sudbury and District Health Unit

Sudbury Community Legal Clinic

Sudbury Community Service Centre

Victorian Order of Nurses

Metro

Bellcrest Childrens' Centre

Canadian Red Cross Society/Toronto Scarborough/Jane Finch

Catholic Childrens' Aid Society

Childrens' Aid Society of Metro Toronto

Community Guardians

Community Occupational Therapy Associates

D. B. Hood Community School

Dixon Hall Neighbourhood Social and Family Service Centre

Etobicoke Health Department

Family Service Association of Metro Toronto

Meals on Wheels

Metro Toronto Branch Visiting Homemakers

Metro Toronto Department of Community Services

Metro Toronto Police Department

Ministry of Community and Social Services - Family Benefits

North York Department of Public Health

Sacred Heart Family and Child Centre

Scarborough Community Legal Services

Scarborough Department of Health

Scarborough Volunteer Centre

Teesdale Community Centre

Victorian Order of Nurses

Warden Woods Church and Community Centre

West Hill Community Services

Willowridge Neighbourhood Centre

York Community Services

Metro (con't)

York West Meals on Wheels

York West Services for Seniors

APPENDIX 3: METHODOLOGY: TENANT SURVEY

APPENDIX 3: METHODOLOGY: TENANT SURVEY

A.3.1 Study Population and Sampling Design

The study population consisted of seniors (age 60 or more) living in public housing in the province of Ontario. The majority of housing authorities within the province supply information about their tenants into the Unit Tenant Master File (UTMF) maintained by the Ministry of Housing. The UTMF is coded in the Operational Financial Information System (OFIS) and may be linked to the Building Address File (BAF) maintained by that ministry. Since some of the information to be used in the analysis is to come from the OFIS data source, it was necessary to draw the sample of tenants to be surveyed from this data base.

Not all housing authorities computerize their tenant information using the UTMF, and, as a result, this group was excluded from the sampling population. The excluded group comprises tenants in housing projects in small towns and rural or northern areas. Consequently, the sample drawn for purposes of this study was not a random sample of all housing projects in Ontario, but rather only of those housing authorities linked to the Ministry's UTMF.

About thirty-five per cent (35.4) of the public housing tenants on this file resided within the Metropolitan Toronto area and the remaining lived in other municipalities across Ontario.

The sampling method employed a three stage probability process including the selection of municipalities in which to sample; the selection of housing projects to be sampled within the selected municipalities and; the selection of senior and family tenants within selected housing projects. Each stage will be discussed in more detail below.

Selection of Municipalities -

The study design called for 1000 interviews in total. Based on the proportion of public housing tenants located in and outside of Metropolitan Toronto 354 tenants were selected from the Metropolitan Toronto area (including Toronto, Etobicoke, Scarborough, York and North York) and 646 tenants from elsewhere in Ontario. Outside Toronto six municipalities were randomly selected to represent other Ontario municipalities. These included Belleville, London, Owen Sound, Peterborough, St. Catharines and Sudbury.

Selection of Housing Projects -

The second stage involved the determination of senior and family tenant population for each community and for each selected housing project. The number of interviews to be completed in each municipality was to be proportionate to the total number of family and senior citizen tenants in public housing in each municipality to the total number of tenants for the six municipalities. Table A.3.1 shows the figures used to determine the number of interviews in each municipality. Note that at the

TABLE A.3.1

Survey of Service Use Patterns of Public Housing Tenants in Ontario
Sampling Frame

Municipalities & Housing Authorities	Total Number of Tenants	Number of Families	Number of Seniors	Number of Tenants to be Interviewed			Number of Housing Projects		
				Total	Family	Senior	Family	Mixed	Senior
St. Catharines, North Niagara	1,032	416	616	87	35	52	2	0	2
London, London & Middlesex	3,123	858	2,265	264	73	191	3	0	6
Owen Sound, Grey County & Owen Sound	501	148	353	43	13	30	2	0	2
Peterborough, Peterborough	684	369	315	58	31	27	2	0	2
Belleville, Hastings & Prince Edward	617	210	407	53	18	35	2	0	2
Sudbury, Sudbury District	1,667	1,023	644	141	87	54	4	0	2
Sub-Total, Six Communities Outside Metropolitan Toronto	7,624	3,024	4,600	646	257	389	15	0	16
Metropolitan Toronto* Metropolitan Toronto	29,282	20,112	9,170	354	244	110	0	19**	0
Total	36,906	23,136	13,770	1,000	501	499	15	19	16

* Comprised of 7 municipalities excluding East York

** In Metropolitan Toronto, senior citizens and families reside in mixed housing projects time of sampling, it was not possible to distinguish family tenants from seniors tenants in Metropolitan Toronto. As well, the Ontario Housing Corporation is only one of many suppliers of public housing in Toronto. Seniors' housing, for example, is also supplied through the Metropolitan Toronto Housing Company Ltd. and by Cityhome. As such, the pattern of supports received by seniors in Toronto may not be an accurate reflection of the situation of all seniors in public housing in Metro.

Selection of Tenants Within Selected Housing Projects -

Finally, the third stage of sampling involved randomly selecting seniors and tenants in each of the selected projects.

A.3.2 Census Demographics of Municipalities Surveyed

Table A.3.2 presents the total populations and the population broken down by age groups for each municipality according to the 1981 Census. In terms of overall population size, the municipalities are ranked in descending order as follows: Metropolitan Toronto (2,136,400), London (254,275), Sudbury (124,015), St. Catharines (91,830), Peterborough (60,635), Belleville (34,890) and Owen Sound (19,875). Sudbury appears to have proportionately more young people under the age of 19 (32.4%) than the other municipalities (which range from 27.0% for Metropolitan Toronto to 30.6% for St. Catharines). Owen Sound (20.8%) and Peterborough (19.0%) had the highest proportion of older residents (60 years and over), compared to Belleville (18.0%), St. Catharines (16.6%), Metropolitan Toronto (14.9%), London (14.3%) and Sudbury (13.4%).

A second demographic characteristic compiled for each municipality was private household income (see Table A.3.3). The median private household income, according to the 1981 Census, was slightly higher in the larger municipalities of Metropolitan Toronto ($23,301), St. Catharines ($21,256) and London ($20,635) than in the three smaller municipalities of Peterborough ($19,866), Belleville ($18,598) and Owen Sound ($17,417).

TABLE A.3.2

Total Population and Population by Age Groups for Each Municipality
(1981 Census)

							Municipalities							
Population Age Groups	Belleville		London		Owen Sound		Peterborough		St. Catharines		Sudbury		Metropolitan Toronto*	
	(N)	%	(N)	%	(N)	%	(N)	%	(N)	%	(N)	%	(N)	%
19 and Under	10,370	29.7	75,230	29.6	5,925	29.8	17,660	29.1	37,950	30.6	29,770	32.4	578,000	27.0
20 to 29	6,205	17.8	51,860	20.4	3,390	17.0	11,050	18.2	20,125	16.2	16,260	17.7	411,465	19.3
30 to 39	4,320	12.4	38,305	15.1	2,570	12.9	8,180	13.5	17,415	14.0	12,115	13.2	325,860	15.2
40 to 49	3,625	10.4	26,630	10.5	1,890	9.5	6,030	9.9	13,675	11.0	10,355	11.3	251,525	11.8
50 to 59	4,105	11.8	25,855	10.2	1,960	9.9	6,785	11.2	14,180	11.4	11,000	12.0	252,375	11.8
60 to 64	1,835	5.3	10,505	4.1	925	4.7	3,195	5.3	5,950	4.8	4,005	4.4	92,065	4.3
65 to 74	2,800	8.0	15,795	6.2	1,775	8.9	5,265	8.7	9,095	7.3	5,625	6.1	139,250	6.5
75 to 84	1,270	3.6	7,695	3.0	1,065	5.4	2,335	3.9	4,350	3.5	2,210	2.4	68,005	3.2
85 and Over	370	1.1	2,390	0.9	375	1.9	745	1.2	1,175	0.9	490	0.5	18,785	0.9
Median Age	31.8		30.0		32.0		32.4		32.1		29.9		32.1	
Total N	34,880		254,280		19,885		60,620		124,020		91,830		2,137,390	

(Source: 1981 Census of Canada, "Population, Occupied Private Dwellings, Private Households, Census Families in Private Households, Selected Characteristics, Ontario", Table 10, Ottawa, Ministry of Supply and Services, Canada, December 1982 Catalogue # 93-918 Vol. 2, Provincial Series, ISBN 0-0660-51104-5)

TABLE A.3.3

Median Private Annual Household Incomes
for Each Municipality
(1981 Census)

Municipality	Median Private Annual Household Income	Number of Households
Belleville,	$18,598	13,280
London,	$20,635	96,525
Metropolitan Toronto	$23,301	776,380
Owen Sound,	$17,417	7,475
Peterborough,	$19,866	22,505
St. Catharines,	$21,256	44,380
Sudbury,	$21,010	32,030
Total		992,575

(Source: 1981 Census of Canada. "Population, Occupied Private Dwellings, Private Households and Census and Economic Families in Private Households" Ottawa, Minister of Supply and Services, Canada, ISBN 0-660-51669-1)

A.3.3 Study Design and Methodology

Preliminary versions of the questionnaires were prepared under separate contract by Forma Consultants. These questionnaires were subsequently revised by Social Data Research under the supervision of the Steering Committee (see Appendix 1 for copies of the questionnaires).

The tenant survey included questions on the need for and use of supports, both formal supports such as those provided by social service agencies, community groups or organizations and informal supports (i.e. assistance provided by family, friends and neighbours). Also included were questions on health and demographic and personal characteristics (i.e., age, sex, household status, education, income). There is a growing body of gerontological research in these areas and the decision was made to use selected items from previous research instruments as measures in this survey. As well, a survey of elderly residents in Ontario had been conducted by the United Senior Citizens of Ontario (USCO) in 1982. Many of the areas of interest on the USCO survey overlapped with the concerns for senior tenants in public housing. The decision was therefore made to use (sometimes in a modified form) many of the questions from this survey. This would allow comparisons of findings for the public housing seniors to elderly persons in general and indicate how public housing seniors may (or may not) differ in their need for and use of supports.

Items were selected from the Older American Resources and Services Program (OARS) and the Instrumental and Physical Activities of Daily Living Scale (ADL) (see Question 3) to measure the ability of seniors to perform activities of daily living. These items were modified for purposes of this survey. A somewhat different version of the OARS ADL was used in the USCO survey, but some comparisons are possible. Other areas of interest addressed by both this survey and the USCO survey included social contacts with family and friends, health, use of the health care system, receipt of assistance, the use of specific social service or community agencies and basic demographic variables.

A.3.4 Fieldwork Procedure

Prior to the personal interview, tenants in the sample were sent a pre-notification letter from the Ministry of Housing and signed by the Director of Housing Policy and Program Development Branch. This letter informed them about the study; asked for their assistance; and told them that an interviewer would be calling at their home to arrange an interview. The tenant survey was carried out by a team of twenty interviewers across the province. Each interviewer was assigned a sample of tenants from one or more housing projects. Interviewers spent the day in a project, calling upon the designated tenants and arranging a mutually convenient time to interview the tenant. Tenants were given the opportunity to refuse to participate if they so desired.

The interviewing began in mid-January of 1985 and was largely completed by March 1, 1985. Interviews took about one hour, on the average, to complete.

TABLE A.3.4

Public Housing Senior Citizen Tenants by the Target and Actual Number of Interviews

Municipality	Target Number of Interviews	Number of Interviews Completed
Sudbury,	54	56
London,	191	191
Belleville,	35	35
St. Catharines,	52	52
Owen Sound,	30	30
Peterborough,	35	28
Metropolitan Toronto*	?	87
Total	397	479

* Note, the target proportions of senior citizen and family respondents for Metropolitan Toronto were not known prior to the initiation of tenant interviews. The number interviewed is however in proportion with the number of senior citizen public housing tenants in Metropolitan Toronto.

A.3.5 Response Rates and Biases

Table A.3.4 shows the target and actual number of interviews obtained in each of the municipalities. While it was possible to identify seniors versus families in public housing in six of the municipalities prior to the interview, this was not possible in Toronto. Consequently, we were not able to target the number of seniors interviews to complete in Toronto prior to the fieldwork stage of the study. The data in Table A.3.4 verifies that, with two minor exceptions, the number of interviews completed reached the number targeted for that municipality.

Table A.3.5 shows that, of those contacted, 80.4 per cent were interviewed, 15.8 per cent refused to be interviewed and 3.9 per cent were contacted but not interviewed. This last group included those who asked the interviewer to call back for an interview at a later time, however, before the interview could be undertaken, the target number of interviews for that housing project or municipality had been reached.

The response rate varied somewhat by municipality. For example, Table A.3.5 shows that the response rate was lower in Metropolitan Toronto (75.0%) and higher in Sudbury (84.9%), St. Catharines (83.9%) and Peterborough (84.9%).

The refusal rate was 15.8 per cent, although it did vary from municipality to municipality. Rates in London (11.3%) and Toronto (13.3%) were slightly higher than in Sudbury (4.6%) and

TABLE A.3.5

Public Housing Seniors Fieldwork Report

Municipality	Housheolds Contacted	Per Cent Interviewed	Per Cent Refused	Per Cent Non Response*
Sudbury,	66	84.9	4.6	10.5
London,	238	80.3	11.3	8.4
Belleville,	44	79.5	9.1	11.4
St. Catharines,	62	83.9	3.2	12.9
Owen Sound,	37	81.1	8.1	10.8
Peterborough,	33	84.9	9.1	6.0
Metropolitan Toronto	116	75.0	10.3	14.7
Total	596	80.4	9.1	10.5

* Includes households that asked the interviewer to call back for interview at a later time, however, before the interview could undertaken, the target number of interviews had been reached. For more detail see the tables in Appendix 4.

St. Catharines (3.2%) where the least people refused.

Interviewers were asked to comment in detail on the reason for each refusal. Analysis of this data suggests that there was no disproportionate tendency for those who refused to do so for health-related reasons. (See Appendix 5 for a detailed breakdown of refusals and non responses). As well, a comparison of the ages of those who were interviewed and those who refused indicate no age bias in the response rate.

A.3.6 Sample Bias

The distribution of age, household status and sex of senior respondents were compared to the distributions for heads of households for all public housing tenants in Ontario on the Ministry's UTMF and to the distributions for the eleven municipalities surveyed. Table A.3.6 shows that the public housing tenants surveyed tend to be somewhat older, on the average, than seniors who are heads of households in public housing generally. These data also show that females were disproportionately surveyed (78.5% vs. 71.2% of the UTMF population). Tenants who live alone were also over represented in the survey (89.8% vs. 83.0% of the UTMF population). These sample biases may partly be explained by the fact that the survey was conducted during the winter of 1984 and these groups of tenants were more likely to be at home than the younger tenants. As well, those interviewed were not necessarily the heads of households, but tenants who were home at the time and willing to be interviewed (i.e., female homemakers).

These sample biases are important to consider if the reader wishes to make any projections from the sample to the population of public housing tenants.

TABLE A.3.6

Age Groupings, Household Status and Sex of Household Head, in the Population of Public Housing Tenants in Ontario*, in the Population of Tenants in the Eleven Communities Surveyed and in the Sample of Tenant Respondents

Demographic Characteristics	Provincial Tenant Population*	Tenant Population in the Eleven Communities	Tenant Respondent Population
Age of Household Head			
60 to 74	60.9	66.0	49.5
75 to 84	31.8	28.7	39.1
85 or More	7.2	5.3	10.8
Household Status			
Lives Alone	83.0	80.6	89.8
Is Not Alone	17.0	19.4	10.2
Sex of Household Head			
Male	28.8	30.8	21.5
Female	71.2	69.2	78.5
Total N	27,181	13,874	479

* The provincial population of tenants is derived from the Ministry of Housing, Unit Tenant Master File, a large data base of tenant data. It contains data for about 80 per cent of public housing tenants in the province. Those tenants not included in the UTMF file reside in rural or smaller centers. The centers included are: Belleville, Cambridge, Guelph, Hamilton, Kingston, Kitchener/Waterloo, London, Mississagua, Metropolitan Toronto, Niagara Falls, Ottawa, Owen Sound, Peterborough, Sault St. Marie, St. Catharines, Sudbury, Thunder Bay and Windsor.

A.3.7 Coding

A detailed manual which includes instructions on how to code each question was prepared for the coders. The coding process involved the assignment of numbers to all information recorded. Four coders were trained and the first several questionnaires coded by each coder were checked thoroughly for errors. After the supervisor was satisfied that each coder was accurate and reliable, questionnaires were then randomly checked for errors. Since most of the questions in the questionnaire were closed-ended and pre-coded on the instrument itself, the bulk of the coding involved only the transfer of the code to a coding sheet. In some instances, however, the questions were open-ended and the coders had to refer to the coding manual for the correct code for particular answers. Codes were developed for open-ended questions and added to the manual as they were being coded. The coding manual is available through the Ministry of Housing.

TABLE A.3.7

Senior Citizen Public Housing Respndents, Survey Reliability as Reported by the Interviewers

Interviewer Reliability Rating	N	%
Tenant Co-operation		
Co-operative and Interested	410	85.6
Co-operative but Indifferent	36	7.5
Changeable, Anxious	15	3.1
Suspicious, Guarded	10	2.0
Hostile, Unco-operative	7	1.5
Missing	1	0.2
Tenant Comprehension		
Quick and Correct	346	72.2
Slow but Correct	89	18.6
Slow and Confused	36	7.5
Quick but Not Correct	5	1.0
Barely Able to Function	2	0.4
Missing	1	0.2
Tenant Memory		
Good	389	83.0
Fair	68	14.1
Poor	9	1.9
Missing	4	0.8
Reliability of Answers		
Completely Reliable	388	81.0
Reliable on Most	87	18.1
Reliable on a Few	3	0.6
Missing	1	0.2
Tenant Activity		
Normally Active	413	86.2
Confined to the House	61	12.7
Confined to a Wheelchair	3	0.6
Confined to Bed	1	0.2
Missing	1	0.2
Tenants With Distinguishable Disabilities		
Yes	154	32.2
No	323	67.4
Missing	2	0.4

A.3.8 Data Entry, Editing and Analysis

Once the data were coded, they were entered directly into a computer file by data entry clerks at the Ministry of Housing. Upon completion of data entry and verification, the data were edited for out-of-range and inconsistent responses (out-of-range responses are those in which there is no response category for a particular question which corresponds to the code that has been entered). Inconsistent responses are those which appear to conflict with responses to certain other questions.

After the data had been edited using the procedures outlined above, a fully documented SAS data base was set up. Data from the Ministry of Housing UTMF was then merged with this SAS data base. A set of frequencies was produced (i.e., the incidence and percentage of coded responses to each question) and from this a frequency manual was developed. This manual is also available from the Ministry of Housing.

A.3.9 Impressions of the Interviewers

The interviewers selected for the project were either experienced interviewers or professionals such as nurses or social workers. After completing the interview, the interviewers were instructed to fill out a comment sheet to provide information on the quality of the interview and the co-operation of the respondent. The interviewers reported that 93.1 per cent of the respondents were co-operative (see Table A.3.7). The interviewers' impressions of the quality of the interviews lend credence to the contention that the interviews accurately reflect the situation of seniors in public housing across the eleven municipalities surveyed.

The interviewers were also instructed to comment on the activity level and any distinguishable disabilities exhibited by the seniors. While completely subjective, the interviewers did note that almost fourteen per cent of the seniors appeared to be "confined to the house" and that thirty-two per cent had a disability. The most frequent disabilities mentioned included a hearing problem (14%), immobility (7%) and a sight problem (5%).

APPENDIX 4: TENANT RESPONSE RATES TABLES

APPENDIX 4, TABLE 1: SURVEY OF SUPPORT USE PATTERNS OF PUBLIC HOUSING TENANTS IN ONTARIO: STATUS REPORT ON TENANT QUESTIONNAIRE FIELDWORK

COMMUNITIES COMPRISING THE SAMPLE	TENANT HOUSEHOLD TYPES	- TENANTS CONTACTED -		- TENANT RESPONSE -		TENANT REFUSALS						TENANT NON-RESPONSE			
								Refusal Rationale						Rationale	
		TOTAL CONTACTED	RATES BY TYPE	TOTAL INTERVIEWED	RATES BY COMMUNITY	TOTAL REFUSED	RATES BY COMMUNITY	Simple Refusals	Not Completed	Health Reasons	Language Difficulty	TOTAL NON-RESPONSE	RATES BY COMMUNITY	Contacted, No Interview	Unlocatable
SUDBURY	Seniors	66	11.07%	56	84.85%	7	10.61%	3	0	0	4	3	.09	2	1
	Families	93	14.86%	86	92.47%	5	5.38%	3	0	1	1	2	.04	2	0
	Total	159	13.01%	142	89.31%	12	7.55%	6	0	1	5	5	.06	4	1
				142											
LONDON	Seniors	238	39.93%	191	80.25%	40	16.81%	27	3	5	5	7	.06	3	4
	Families	87	13.90%	73	83.91%	9	10.34%	8	0	1	0	5	.12	5	0
	Total	325	26.60%	264	81.23%	49	15.08%	35	3	6	5	12	.07	8	4
				264											
BELLEVILLE	Seniors	44	7.38%	35	79.55%	8	15.18%	4	0	4	0	1	.05	1	0
	Families	21	3.35%	18	85.71%	1	4.76%	1	0	0	0	2	.20	2	0
	Total	65	5.32%	53	81.54%	9	13.85%	5	0	4	0	3	.09	3	0
ST. CATHARINES	Seniors	62	10.40%	52	83.87%	9	14.52%	2	0	4	3	1	.03	0	1
	Families	39	6.23%	35	89.74%	2	5.13%	1	0	0	1	2	.11	2	0
	Total	101	8.27%	87	86.14%	11	10.89%	3	0	4	4	3	.06	2	1
OWEN SOUND	Seniors	37	6.21%	30	81.08%	5	13.51%	3	0	2	0	2	.11	2	0
	Families	14	2.24%	13	92.86%	1	7.14%	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Total	51	4.17%	43	84.31%	6	11.76%	4	0	2	0	2	.08	2	0
PETERBOROUGH	Seniors	33	5.54%	28	84.85%	4	12.12%	3	0	1	0	1	.06	1	0
	Families	40	6.39%	29	72.50%	7	17.50%	5	0	2	0	4	.21	0	4
	Total	73	5.97%	57	78.08%	11	15.07%	8	0	3	0	5	.14	1	4
TORONTO	Seniors	15	2.52%	11	73.33%	3	20.00%	2	0	0	1	1	.14	1	0
	Families	96	15.34%	72	75.00%	14	14.58%	10	0	0	4	10	.21	10	0
	Total	111	9.08%	83	74.77%	17	15.32%	12	0	0	5	11	.20	11	0
NORTH YORK	Seniors	22	3.69%	14	63.64%	6	27.27%	3	1	1	1	2	.19	2	0
	Families	110	17.57%	96	87.27%	3	2.73%	1	0	2	0	11	.20	11	0
	Total	132	10.80%	110	83.33%	9	6.82%	4	1	3	1	13	.20	13	0
ETOBICOKE	Seniors	4	.67%	4	100.00%	0	.00%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Families	21	3.35%	20	95.24%	0	.00%	0	0	0	0	1	.10	1	0
	Total	25	2.05%	24	96.00%	0	.00%	0	0	0	0	1	.08	1	0
SCARBOROUGH	Seniors	41	6.88%	34	82.93%	5	12.20%	2	0	2	1	2	.10	2	0
	Families	76	12.14%	60	78.95%	4	5.26%	1	0	1	2	12	.32	12	0
	Total	117	9.57%	94	80.34%	9	7.69%	3	0	3	3	14	.24	14	0
YORK	Seniors	34	5.70%	24	70.59%	7	20.59%	5	0	0	2	3	.18	3	0
	Families	29	4.63%	19	65.52%	9	31.03%	6	1	2	0	1	.07	1	0
	Total	63	5.16%	43	68.25%	16	25.40%	11	1	2	2	4	.13	4	0
TOTALS	SENIORS	596	48.77%	479	47.90%	94	63.09%	54	4	19	17	23	31.51%	17	6
	FAMILIES	626	51.23%	521	52.10%	55	36.91%	37	1	9	8	50	68.49%	46	4
	TOTAL	1222	100.00%	1000	100.00%	149	100.00%	91	5	28	25	73	100.00%	63	10
				Response Rates:		Refusal Rates:						Non-Response Rates:			
PER CENT	SENIORS	100.00%	-	80.37%	-	15.77%	-	9.06%	.67%	3.19%	2.85%	3.86%	-	2.85%	1.01%
	FAMILIES	100.00%	-	83.23%	-	8.79%	-	5.91%	.16%	1.44%	1.28%	7.99%	-	7.35%	.64%
	TOTAL	100.00%	-	81.83%	-	12.19%	-	7.45%	.41%	2.29%	2.05%	5.97%	-	5.16%	.82%

FINAL REPORT DATE: 1986/07/23

APPENDIX 4, TABLE 2: SURVEY OF SUPPORT USE PATTERNS OF PUBLIC HOUSING TENANTS IN ONTARIO: TENANT HOUSEHOLDS EXCLUDED FROM THE SURVEY

COMMUNITIES COMPRISING THE SAMPLE	TENANT HOUSEHOLD TYPES	TOTAL				TENANT HOUSEHOLDS EXCLUDED FROM THE SURVEY						
		TENANTS CONTACTED	TENANTS INTERVIEWED	TENANTS REFUSED	NON-RESPONSE	TOTAL EXCLUDED	RATES BY COMMUNITY	Never Contacted	Not Eligible	Moved Out	Deceased	Don't Know
SUDBURY	Seniors	66	56	7	3	41	24.40%	37	2	0	0	2
	Families	93	86	5	2	32	14.41%	32	0	0	0	0
	Total	159	142	12	5	73	18.02%	69	2	0	0	2
LONDON	Seniors	238	191	40	7	57	33.93%	50	1	3	2	1
	Families	87	73	9	5	35	15.77%	35	0	0	0	0
	Total	325	264	49	12	92	22.72%	85	1	3	2	1
BELLEVILLE	Seniors	44	35	8	1	7	4.17%	6	0	0	1	0
	Families	21	18	1	2	4	1.80%	4	0	0	0	0
	Total	65	53	9	3	11	2.72%	10	0	0	1	0
ST. CATHARINES	Seniors	62	52	9	1	22	13.10%	21	0	1	0	0
	Families	39	35	2	2	13	5.86%	13	0	0	0	0
	Total	101	87	11	3	35	8.64%	34	0	1	0	0
OWEN SOUND	Seniors	37	30	5	2	13	7.74%	12	0	0	1	0
	Families	14	13	1	0	8	3.60%	8	0	0	0	0
	Total	51	43	6	2	21	5.19%	20	0	0	1	0
PETERBOROUGH	Seniors	33	28	4	1	11	6.55%	11	0	0	0	0
	Families	40	29	7	4	3	.00%	0	0	3	0	0
	Total	73	57	11	5	14	.00%	11	0	3	0	0
TORONTO	Seniors	15	11	3	1	4	2.38%	4	0	0	0	0
	Families	96	72	14	10	36	16.22%	36	0	0	0	0
	Total	111	83	17	11	42	10.37%	40	1	0	0	1
NORTH YORK	Seniors	22	14	6	2	3	1.79%	3	0	0	0	0
	Families	110	96	3	11	43	19.37%	43	0	0	0	0
	Total	132	110	9	13	51	12.59%	46	1	3	0	1
ETOBICOKE	Seniors	4	4	0	0	3	1.79%	3	0	0	0	0
	Families	21	20	0	1	18	8.11%	18	0	0	0	0
	Total	25	24	0	1	21	5.19%	21	0	0	0	0
SCARBOROUGH	Seniors	41	34	5	2	9	5.36%	7	0	1	1	0
	Families	76	60	4	12	24	10.81%	23	1	0	0	0
	Total	117	94	9	14	34	8.40%	30	1	1	1	1
YORK	Seniors	34	24	7	3	4	2.38%	4	0	0	0	0
	Families	29	19	9	1	7	3.15%	7	0	0	0	0
	Total	63	43	16	4	11	2.72%	11	0	0	0	0
TOTALS	SENIORS	596	479	94	23	168	41.48%	158	0	5	5	0
	FAMILIES	626	521	55	50	222	54.81%	219	0	3	0	0
	TOTAL	1222	1000	149	73	405	100.00%	377	6	11	5	6
PER CENT	SENIORS	100.00%	80.37%	15.77%	3.86%	100.00%	-	94.05%	.00%	2.98%	2.98%	.00%
	FAMILIES	100.00%	83.23%	8.79%	7.99%	100.00%	-	98.65%	.00%	1.35%	.00%	.00%
	TOTAL	100.00%	81.83%	12.19%	5.97%	100.00%	-	93.09%	1.48%	2.72%	1.23%	1.48%

NOTE: Households excluded are not included in the response, refusal or non-response totals or rates.

FINAL REPORT DATE: 1986/07/23

APPENDIX 4, TABLE 3: SURVEY OF SUPORT USE PATTERNS OF PUBLIC HOUSING TENANTS IN ONTARIO: IN DEPTH ANALYSIS OF REFUSALS SEEKING REFUSALS FOR POTENTIAL MEDICAL REASONS

COMMUNITIES COMPRISING THE SAMPLE	TENANT HOUSEHOLD TYPES	TOTAL		SIMPLE REFUSALS (Table 1)	TENANT RATIONALE TO INTERVIEWERS FOR SIMPLE REFUSALS											
		TENANTS CONTACTED	INTERVIEWS COMPLETED		Without Giving Reason	Wished Not To Answer	Denied Advance Notice	Not Interested	Bothered Enough	Not Using Any Services	Language Difficulty	Potential Medical Refusals				
												Recent Death	Not Well	Hearing Difficulty	Too Tired	Too Personal
SUDBURY	Seniors	66	56	3	0	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Family	93	86	3	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Total	159	142	6	3	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
LONDON	Seniors	238	191	27	3	8	1	8	2	2	0	0	1	1	1	0
	Family	87	73	8	1	2	0	4	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0
	Total	325	264	35	4	10	1	12	2	2	0	1	1	1	1	0
BELLEVILLE	Seniors	44	35	4	0	1	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Family	21	18	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Total	65	53	5	0	2	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
ST. CATHARINES	Seniors	62	52	2	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Family	39	35	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Total	101	87	3	1	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
OWEN SOUND	Seniors	37	30	3	0	1	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Family	14	13	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Total	51	43	4	0	2	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
PETERBOROUGH	Seniors	33	28	3	0	0	0	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Family	40	29	5	1	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1
	Total	73	57	8	1	1	0	3	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	1
TORONTO	Seniors	15	11	2	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0
	Family	96	72	10	2	2	0	3	0	2	1	0	0	0	0	0
	Total	111	83	12	2	2	0	4	0	2	1	0	1	0	0	0
NORTH YORK	Seniors	22	14	3	2	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Family	110	96	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Total	132	110	4	3	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
ETOBICOKE	Seniors	4	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Family	21	20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Total	25	24	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
SCARBOROUGH	Seniors	41	34	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0
	Family	76	60	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Total	117	94	3	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0
YORK	Seniors	34	24	5	1	2	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0
	Family	29	19	6	0	0	0	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
	Total	63	43	11	1	2	0	5	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	1
COLUMN TOTALS	Seniors	596	479	54	7	14	4	16	4	2	1	0	4	1	1	0
	Family	626	521	37	10	7	0	13	0	2	1	1	1	0	0	2
	Total	1222	1000	91	17	21	4	29	4	4	2	1	5	1	1	2
ROW PERCENTS	Seniors	100.00%	80.37%	100.00%	12.96%	25.93%	7.41%	29.63%	7.41%	3.70%	1.85%	.00%	7.41%	1.85%	1.85%	.00%
	Family	100.00%	83.23%	100.00%	27.03%	18.92%	.00%	35.14%	.00%	5.41%	2.70%	2.70%	2.70%	.00%	.00%	5.41%
	Total	100.00%	81.83%	100.00%	18.68%	23.08%	4.40%	31.87%	4.40%	4.40%	2.20%	1.10%	5.49%	1.10%	1.10%	2.20%
COLUMNS PERCENTS	Seniors	48.77%	5.40%	59.34%	41.18%	66.67%	100.00%	55.17%	100.00%	50.00%	50.00%	.00%	80.00%	100.00%	100.00%	.00%
	Family	51.23%	52.10%	40.66%	58.82%	33.33%	.00%	44.83%	.00%	50.00%	50.00%	100.00%	20.00%	.00%	.00%	100.00%
	Total	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%

FINAL REPORT DATE: 86/07/23

APPENDIX 4: TABLE 4

SURVEY OF SUPORT USE PATTERNS OF PUBLIC HOUSING TENANTS IN ONTARIO
SUMMARY OF TENANT REFUSALS FOR POTENTIAL MEDICAL REASONS

TENANT TYPE	Sub Total Apendix 4 Table 1	Sub Total Apendix 4 Table 3	TOTAL POTENTIAL MEDICAL REFUSALS
Seniors	19	6	25
Families	9	4	13
TOTAL	28	10	38

POTENTIAL MEDICAL REFUSALS include Health Reasons, from Table 1, and from Table 3: Recent Death, Not Well, Hearing Difficulty, Too Tired and Questions Too Personal.

The tenants who displayed potential medical refusals above were analysed to determine, whether their reason for refusal and age were in any way related. Upon examination, no such relationships were found.

All tables in Appendix 4 were prepared by Brenda Nussey, Brenda Stewart and George Hough.

FINAL REPORT DATE: 86/07/23

APPENDIX 5: QUESTIONNAIRES

I.D. ____________

SENIOR CITIZEN QUESTIONNAIRE

A STUDY OF THE NEED AND USE PATTERNS
OF SUPPORT SERVICES
AMONG PUBLIC HOUSING TENANTS

I.D. ____________

COMMUNITY AGENCY CARD

Agencies Respondent Uses (Please Check)	Refer to: Q.3	Q.4

SENIOR CITIZEN QUESTIONNAIRE

A STUDY OF THE NEED AND USE PATTERNS OF SUPPORT SERVICES AMONG PUBLIC HOUSING TENANTS

NAME: --

ADDRESS: --
(Street Name and No.) (Unit No.) (City or Borough)

TELEPHONE: ---------------------

RECORD OF VISITS

	Date	APPOINTMENT MADE Date	 Time	LENGTH OF INTERVIEW Start	 Finished	Result of Call
1st Call						
2nd Call						
3rd Call						
4th Call						
5th Call						

INTERVIEWER: VERIFY TELEPHONE NUMBER IN CASE CALL-BACKS ARE REQUIRED.

FINAL RESULT

1. Completed
2. Semi-Completed
3. Refused
4. Not at home
5. Ill or infirm
6. Other (SPECIFY) -----------------

NAME OF INTERVIEWER:

ID OF RESPONDENT:

INTRODUCTION

Hello, my name is_________. We are conducting a study of tenant needs for the Ontario government. Did you receive our letter?

The purpose of the study is to increase our understanding as to how Senior citizens in assisted housing find help for the kinds of needs that all people have from time to time.

(INTERVIEWER: DO NOT READ UNLESS RESPONDENT REQUESTS INFORMATION ABOUT CONTENTS OF QUESTIONNAIRE.)

The questionnaire involves a number of questions about seniors, health and matters affecting health, convenience of services and facilities, social activities, social services, economic and related matters.

The interview is strictly confidential, and YOUR ANSWERS WILL NEVER BE SEEN BY ANYONE OTHER THAN OUR RESEARCHERS. NO ONE WILL SEE YOUR ANSWERS, NOT EVEN THE GOVERNMENT MINISTRIES THAT HAVE HIRED US TO DO THE SURVEY.

First, I would like to ask you some questions about yourself, your apartment, and your living arrangements.

1.1 How many years have you lived in this neighbourhood?

______(Years)

1.2 Could you tell me approximately what year you moved to this project? (PROBE)

_____ (Year)

Now I have a few questions about your family and close relatives who do not live with you.

2.1 Do you have any children living elsewhere (daughters or sons)?

1. Yes (IF YES) How many sons? ____ (Number)
   How many daughters? ____ (Number)
2. No

2.2 Do you have any other relatives living elsewhere?

1. Yes
2. No

(IF RESPONDENT HAS NO CHILDREN OR OTHER RELATIVES GO TO Q.2.8)

2.3 Where do the children (and/or relatives) that you can depend on live?

Do you have children and/or other relatives:	How many Children?	Other Relatives? (Yes/No)
(a) In the building?	------	1 2
(b) In the surrounding neighbourhood?	------	1 2
(c) In the city or community outside of the neighbourhood?	------	1 2
(d) Outside the city or community?	------	1 2

(IF RESPONDENT HAS NO CHILDREN GO TO Q.2.6)

2.4 How often do you:

	Never	Once a Month or Less	2 or 3 Times a Month	Once a Week	2 or 3 Times a Week	4 Times a Week or More
(a) Talk to your children on the phone?	0	1	2	3	4	5
(b) Go to see your children in their homes?	0	1	2	3	4	5
(c) Have your children come to visit you here?	0	1	2	3	4	5

2.5 Do you now see more of your children, less, or about the same, as you did five years ago?

1. More (PROBE WHY)______________________________
2. About the same
3. Less (PROBE WHY)______________________________

(IF RESPONDENT HAS NO OTHER RELATIVES, GO TO Q2.8)

2.6 How often do you:

	Never	Once a Month or Less	2 or 3 Times a Month	Once a Week	2 or 3 Times a Week	4 Times a Week or More
(a) Talk on the phone with your other close relatives	0	1	2	3	4	5
(b) Go to see your close relatives in their homes	0	1	2	3	4	5
(c) Have your close relatives come to visit you here	0	1	2	3	4	5

2.7 Do you now see more of your close relatives (other than children), less, or about the same, as you did five years ago?

1. More (PROBE WHY) ________________________________
2. About the same
3. Less (PROBE WHY)________________________________

2.8 Do you have any close friends that you can depend on:

(ASK FOR EACH LOCATION)

	Yes	No
(a) In the building?	1	2
(b) In the surrounding neighbourhood?	1	2
(c) In the city or community outside of the neighbourhood?	1	2
(d) Outside the city or community?	1	2

(IF NO FRIENDS GIVEN GO TO Q.2.10)

2.9 How often do you:

	Never	Once a Month or Less	2 or 3 Times a Month	Once a Week	2 or 3 Times a Week	4 Times a Week or More
(a) Talk on the phone with your friends?	0	1	2	3	4	5
(b) Go to see your friends in their home?	0	1	2	3	4	5
(c) Have your friends come to visit you here?	0	1	2	3	4	5

2.10 Starting with yourself, could you tell me about the people who normally live in your household, their sex, age, and relationship to you?
(LIST EACH PERSON, SEX, AGE AND RELATIONSHIP TO RESPONDENT) (PROBE - IS THERE ANYONE ELSE?)

Can you tell me what each person usually does during weekdays, whether they stay home, work, go to school, day care, or what?
(PROBE FOR PART TIME ACTIVITIES AND COMBINATIONS)
(IF SCHOOL, WHAT GRADE IS____________ IN?)

Person	Name	Sex	Year of Birth	Relationship to Respondent	Weekday Activity, Work, Education, etc.	Gr. in School/ Year in University
1 Respondent						
2						
3						
4						
5						
6						
7						
8						
9						
10						

(PROBE - IS THAT EVERYONE WHO LIVES HERE?) (IF MORE THAN 10 PERSONS IN HOUSEHOLD, RECORD ALL INFORMATION BELOW.

3.0 Now we would like to talk to you about whether you are getting help for the kinds of needs that all people have from time to time.

First I will ask you about a number of things that people sometimes have difficulty with.

Then I will ask you some questions about any help or services you may be getting.

INTERVIEWER: NOTE THAT THE SAME QUESTIONS ARE ASKED BELOW FOR EACH OF EIGHT ACTIVITIES. FOR EACH QUESTION, THE OBJECTIVE IS TO: (A) IDENTIFY NEED FOR HELP; (B) IDENTIFY IF HELP WAS RECEIVED; AND (C) ASK A NUMBER OF SUB QUESTIONS ABOUT THAT HELP. NOTE THAT MAIN SKIPS ON THE GRID ARE DOWN FOR EACH TYPE OF HELP, AND THEN ACROSS TO ASK ABOUT THE HELP RECEIVED FOR EACH SOURCE. REMEMBER_TO_RECORD_ALL_COMMUNITY_AGENCY_AND_PROJECT STAFF_HELP_ON_THE_AGENCY_CARD.

3.1 Thinking generally of how things have been for you in the past year, how much difficulty have you personally had doing light housework?
Would you say:

1. No difficulty (GO TO Q.3.1.b)
2. A little difficulty
3. A lot of difficulty
4. Could not do at all by yourself
5. (Does not normally carry out this activity...GO TO Q.3.2)

3.1.a What was this difficulty?

____

3.1.b In the past year have you ever had help with doing light housework?

1. Yes - (GO TO Q.3.1.c)
2. No

(IF RESPONDENT HAD NO DIFFICULTY AND NO HELP GO TO Q.3.2)
(IF RESPONDENT HAD DIFFICULTY AND NO HELP ASK:)

Could you have used some help?

1. No (GO TO Q.3.2)
2. Yes...Why aren't you getting help?

____
(GO TO Q.3.2)

3.1.c Who gave you this help? (CIRCLE CODES TO INDICATE EACH TYPE AND PROBE FOR OTHER HELP, "IS THERE ANYONE ELSE (OR ANY OTHER AGENCY) WHO HELPED YOU WITH...?" NOTE DETAILS) RECORD ANY AGENCIES USED ON AGENCY CARD.

	Source 1	Source 2	Source 3
Spouse/Housemate	1	1	1
Children	2	2	2
Other Family	3	3	3
Friend/Neighbour	4	4	4
Project Staff	5	5	5
Community Agency	6	6	6
Other	7	7	7

3.1.d Do they (REFER TO SOURCE OF HELP) live:

In your unit	1	1	1
In your Bldg/Project	2	2	2
Outside of your Bldg/Project	3	3	3

3.1.e What kind of help did they give you:

1. ____
2. ____
3. ____

3.1.f In the past year, how often did you receive this help? Would you say:

4 times a wk or more	1	1	1
2 or 3 times a week	2	2	2
Once a week	3	3	3
1 to 3 times a month	4	4	4
Less than once a month	5	5	5
Other (SPECIFY)	6	6	6

3.1.g How long would you estimate you received (or have been getting) this help from _____?_
(PLEASE RECORD EXACT NUMBER OF DAYS, WEEKS, MONTHS OR YEARS/OR EXACT DATES)

Number of days, weeks months/or Dates	----- Source 1	----- Source 2	----- Source 3

3.1.h (INTERVIEWER PROBE THEN CODE IF HELP WAS...)

Once	1	1	1
On-going,regular	2	2	2
On-going,occassional	3	3	3
Time-limited	4	4	4

3.1.i Did you receive enough help?

Yes	1	1	1
No	2	2	2

Was it the right kind of help?

Yes	1	1	1
No	2	2	2

3.1.j How did you arrange for this help or service?

Myself	1	1	1
CRW	2	2	2
Public health nurse	3	3	3
Physician	4	4	4
Community group	5	5	5
Residential council	6	6	6
Relatives	7	7	7
Other (SPECIFY)			
--------------------	8	8	8

3.1.k Without help from (each source) would you have been able to get by with no difficulty, a little difficulty, a lot of difficulty, or not at all?

With no difficulty	1	1	1
A little difficulty	2	2	2
A lot of difficulty	3	3	3
Not at all	4	4	4

3.2 Thinking generally of how things have been for you in the past year, how much difficulty have you personally had doing heavy cleaning?
Would you say:

1. No difficulty (GO TO Q.3.2.b)
2. A little difficulty
3. A lot of difficulty
4. Could not do at all by yourself
5. (Does not normally carry out this activity...GO TO Q.3.3)

3.2.a What was this difficulty?

____

3.2.b In the past year have you ever had help with doing heavy cleaning?

1. Yes - (GO TO Q.3.2.c)
2. No

(IF RESPONDENT HAD NO DIFFICULTY AND NO HELP GO TO Q.3.3)
(IF RESPONDENT HAD DIFFICULTY AND NO HELP ASK:)

Could you have used some help?

1. No (GO TO Q.3.3)
2. Yes...Why aren't you getting help?

____
(GO TO Q.3.3)

3.2.c Who gave you this help? (CIRCLE CODES TO INDICATE EACH TYPE AND PROBE FOR OTHER HELP, "IS THERE ANYONE ELSE (OR ANY OTHER AGENCY) WHO HELPED YOU WITH...?" NOTE DETAILS) RECORD ANY AGENCIES USED ON AGENCY CARD.

	Source 1	Source 2	Source 3
Spouse/Housemate	1	1	1
Children	2	2	2
Other Family	3	3	3
Friend/Neighbour	4	4	4
Project Staff	5	5	5
Community Agency	6	6	6
Other	7	7	7

3.2.d Do they (REFER TO SOURCE OF HELP) live:

In your unit	1	1	1
In your Bldg/Project	2	2	2
Outside of your Bldg/Project	3	3	3

3.2.e What kind of help did they give you:

1. ____
2. ____
3. ____

3.2.f In the past year, how often did you receive this help? Would you say:

4 times a wk or more	1	1	1
2 or 3 times a week	2	2	2
Once a week	3	3	3
1 to 3 times a month	4	4	4
Less than once a month	5	5	5
Other (SPECIFY)	6	6	6

3.2.g How long would you estimate you received (or have been getting) this help from _____?_ (PLEASE RECORD EXACT NUMBER OF DAYS, WEEKS, MONTHS OR YEARS/OR EXACT DATES)

Number of days, weeks months/or Dates	----- Source 1	----- Source 2	----- Source 3

3.2.h (INTERVIEWER PROBE THEN CODE IF HELP WAS...)

Once	1	1	1
On-going,regular	2	2	2
On-going,occassional	3	3	3
Time-limited	4	4	4

3.2.i Did you receive enough help?

Yes	1	1	1
No	2	2	2

Was it the right kind of help?

Yes	1	1	1
No	2	2	2

3.2.j How did you arrange for this help or service?

Myself	1	1	1
CRW	2	2	2
Public health nurse	3	3	3
Physician	4	4	4
Community group	5	5	5
Residential council	6	6	6
Relatives	7	7	7
Other (SPECIFY) --------------------	8	8	8

3.2.k Without help from (each source) would you have been able to get by with no difficulty, a little difficulty, a lot of difficulty, or not at all?

With no difficulty	1	1	1
A little difficulty	2	2	2
A lot of difficulty	3	3	3
Not at all	4	4	4

3.3 Thinking generally of how things have been for you in the past year, how much difficulty have you personally had preparing regular meals? Would you say:

1. No difficulty (GO TO Q.3.3.b)
2. A little difficulty
3. A lot of difficulty
4. Could not do at all by yourself
5. (Does not normally carry out this activity...GO TO Q.3.4)

3.3.a What was this difficulty?

3.3.b In the past year have you ever had help with preparing regular meals?

1. Yes - (GO TO Q.3.3.c)
2. No

(IF RESPONDENT HAD NO DIFFICULTY AND NO HELP GO TO Q.3.4)
(IF RESPONDENT HAD DIFFICULTY AND NO HELP ASK:)

Could you have used some help?

1. No (GO TO Q.3.4)
2. Yes...Why aren't you getting help?

(GO TO Q.3.4)

3.3.c Who gave you this help? (CIRCLE CODES TO INDICATE EACH TYPE AND PROBE FOR OTHER HELP, "IS THERE ANYONE ELSE (OR ANY OTHER AGENCY) WHO HELPED YOU WITH...?" NOTE DETAILS) RECORD ANY AGENCIES USED ON AGENCY CARD.

	Source 1	Source 2	Source 3
Spouse/Housemate	1	1	1
Children	2	2	2
Other Family	3	3	3
Friend/Neighbour	4	4	4
Project Staff	5	5	5
Community Agency	6	6	6
Other	7	7	7

3.3.d Do they (REFER TO SOURCE OF HELP) live:

In your unit	1	1	1
In your Bldg/Project	2	2	2
Outside of your Bldg/Project	3	3	3

3.3.e What kind of help did they give you:

1. ---
2. ---
3. ---

3.3.f In the past year, how often did you receive this help? Would you say:

4 times a wk or more	1	1	1
2 or 3 times a week	2	2	2
Once a week	3	3	3
1 to 3 times a month	4	4	4
Less than once a month	5	5	5
Other (SPECIFY)	6	6	6

3.3.g How long would you estimate you received (or have been getting) this help from _____?
(PLEASE RECORD EXACT NUMBER OF DAYS, WEEKS, MONTHS OR YEARS/OR EXACT DATES)

Number of days, weeks months/or Dates	_____	_____	_____
	Source 1	Source 2	Source 3

3.3.h (INTERVIEWER PROBE THEN CODE IF HELP WAS...)

Once	1	1	1
On-going,regular	2	2	2
On-going,occassional	3	3	3
Time-limited	4	4	4

3.3.i Did you receive enough help?

Yes	1	1	1
No	2	2	2

Was it the right kind of help?

Yes	1	1	1
No	2	2	2

3.3.j How did you arrange for this help or service?

Myself	1	1	1
CRW	2	2	2
Public health nurse	3	3	3
Physician	4	4	4
Community group	5	5	5
Residential council	6	6	6
Relatives	7	7	7
Other (SPECIFY)			
--------------------	8	8	8

3.3.k Without help from (each source) would you have been able to get by with no difficulty, a little difficulty, a lot of difficulty, or not at all?

With no difficulty	1	1	1
A little difficulty	2	2	2
A lot of difficulty	3	3	3
Not at all	4	4	4

3.4 Thinking generally of how things have been for you in the past year, how much difficulty have you personally had shopping for groceries?
Would you say:

1. No difficulty (GO TO Q.3.4.b)
2. A little difficulty
3. A lot of difficulty
4. Could not do at all by yourself
5. (Does not normally carry out this activity...GO TO Q.3.5)

3.4.a What was this difficulty?

____

3.4.b In the past year have you ever had help with shopping for groceries?

1. Yes - (GO TO Q.3.4.c)
2. No

(IF RESPONDENT HAD NO DIFFICULTY AND NO HELP GO TO Q.3.5)
(IF RESPONDENT HAD DIFFICULTY AND NO HELP ASK:)

Could you have used some help?

1. No (GO TO Q.3.5)
2. Yes...Why aren't you getting help?

____

(GO TO Q.3.5)

3.4.c Who gave you this help? (CIRCLE CODES TO INDICATE EACH TYPE AND PROBE FOR OTHER HELP, "IS THERE ANYONE ELSE (OR ANY OTHER AGENCY) WHO HELPED YOU WITH...?" NOTE DETAILS) RECORD ANY AGENCIES USED ON AGENCY CARD.

	Source 1	Source 2	Source 3
Spouse/Housemate	1	1	1
Children	2	2	2
Other Family	3	3	3
Friend/Neighbour	4	4	4
Project Staff	5	5	5
Community Agency	6	6	6
Other	7	7	7

3.4.d Do they (REFER TO SOURCE OF HELP) live:

In your unit	1	1	1
In your Bldg/Project	2	2	2
Outside of your Bldg/Project	3	3	3

3.4.e What kind of help did they give you:

1. ____
2. ____
3. ____

3.4.f In the past year, how often did you receive this help? Would you say:

4 times a wk or more	1	1	1
2 or 3 times a week	2	2	2
Once a week	3	3	3
1 to 3 times a month	4	4	4
Less than once a month	5	5	5
Other (SPECIFY)	6	6	6

3.4.g How long would you estimate you received (or have been getting) this help from _____?
(PLEASE RECORD EXACT NUMBER OF DAYS, WEEKS, MONTHS OR YEARS/OR EXACT DATES)

Number of days, weeks months/or Dates	_____	_____	_____
	Source 1	Source 2	Source 3

3.4.h (INTERVIEWER PROBE THEN CODE IF HELP WAS...)

Once	1	1	1
On-going,regular	2	2	2
On-going,occassional	3	3	3
Time-limited	4	4	4

3.4.i Did you receive enough help?

Yes	1	1	1
No	2	2	2

Was it the right kind of help?

Yes	1	1	1
No	2	2	2

3.4.j How did you arrange for this help or service?

Myself	1	1	1
CRW	2	2	2
Public health nurse	3	3	3
Physician	4	4	4
Community group	5	5	5
Residential council	6	6	6
Relatives	7	7	7
Other (SPECIFY) --------------------	8	8	8

3.4.k Without help from (each source) would you have been able to get by with no difficulty, a little difficulty, a lot of difficulty, or not at all?

With no difficulty	1	1	1
A little difficulty	2	2	2
A lot of difficulty	3	3	3
Not at all	4	4	4

3.5 Thinking generally of how things have been for you in the past year, how much difficulty have you personally had banking and preparing bills? Would you say:

1. No difficulty (GO TO Q.3.5.b)
2. A little difficulty
3. A lot of difficulty
4. Could not do at all by yourself
5. (Does not normally carry out this activity...GO TO Q.3.6)

3.5.a What was this difficulty?

3.5.b In the past year have you ever had help with banking and preparing bills?

1. Yes - (GO TO Q.3.5.c)
2. No

(IF RESPONDENT HAD NO DIFFICULTY AND NO HELP GO TO Q.3.6)
(IF RESPONDENT HAD DIFFICULTY AND NO HELP ASK:)

Could you have used some help?

1. No (GO TO Q.3.6)
2. Yes...Why aren't you getting help?

(GO TO Q.3.6)

3.5.c Who gave you this help? (CIRCLE CODES TO INDICATE EACH TYPE AND PROBE FOR OTHER HELP, "IS THERE ANYONE ELSE (OR ANY OTHER AGENCY) WHO HELPED YOU WITH...?" NOTE DETAILS) RECORD ANY AGENCIES USED ON AGENCY CARD.

	Source 1	Source 2	Source 3
Spouse/Housemate	1	1	1
Children	2	2	2
Other Family	3	3	3
Friend/Neighbour	4	4	4
Project Staff	5	5	5
Community Agency	6	6	6
Other	7	7	7

3.5.d Do they (REFER TO SOURCE OF HELP) live:

In your unit	1	1	1
In your Bldg/Project	2	2	2
Outside of your Bldg/Project	3	3	3

3.5.e What kind of help did they give you:

1. ---
2. ---
3. ---

3.5.f In the past year, how often did you receive this help? Would you say:

4 times a wk or more	1	1	1
2 or 3 times a week	2	2	2
Once a week	3	3	3
1 to 3 times a month	4	4	4
Less than once a month	5	5	5
Other (SPECIFY)	6	6	6

3.5.g How long would you estimate you received (or have been getting) this help from ______? (PLEASE RECORD EXACT NUMBER OF DAYS, WEEKS, MONTHS OR YEARS/OR EXACT DATES)

Number of days, weeks months/or Dates	-----	-----	-----
	Source 1	Source 2	Source 3

3.5.h (INTERVIEWER PROBE THEN CODE IF HELP WAS...)

Once	1	1	1
On-going,regular	2	2	2
On-going,occassional	3	3	3
Time-limited	4	4	4

3.5.i Did you receive enough help?

Yes	1	1	1
No	2	2	2

Was it the right kind of help?

Yes	1	1	1
No	2	2	2

3.5.j How did you arrange for this help or service?

Myself	1	1	1
CRW	2	2	2
Public health nurse	3	3	3
Physician	4	4	4
Community group	5	5	5
Residential council	6	6	6
Relatives	7	7	7
Other (SPECIFY) --------------------	8	8	8

3.5.k Without help from (each source) would you have been able to get by with no difficulty, a little difficulty, a lot of difficulty, or not at all?

With no difficulty	1	1	1
A little difficulty	2	2	2
A lot of difficulty	3	3	3
Not at all	4	4	4

3.6 Thinking generally of how things have been for you in the past year, how much difficulty have you personally had getting around the community on your own? Would you say:

1. No difficulty (GO TO Q.3.6.b)
2. A little difficulty
3. A lot of difficulty
4. Could not do at all by yourself
5. (Does not normally carry out this activity...GO TO Q.3.7)

3.6.a What was this difficulty?

3.6.b In the past year have you ever had help with getting around the community?

1. Yes - (GO TO Q.3.6.c)
2. No

(IF RESPONDENT HAD NO DIFFICULTY AND NO HELP GO TO Q.3.7)
(IF RESPONDENT HAD DIFFICULTY AND NO HELP ASK:)

Could you have used some help?

1. No (GO TO Q.3.7)
2. Yes...Why aren't you getting help?

(GO TO Q.3.7)

3.6.c Who gave you this help? (CIRCLE CODES TO INDICATE EACH TYPE AND PROBE FOR OTHER HELP, "IS THERE ANYONE ELSE (OR ANY OTHER AGENCY) WHO HELPED YOU WITH...?" NOTE DETAILS) RECORD ANY AGENCIES USED ON AGENCY CARD.

	Source 1	Source 2	Source 3
Spouse/Housemate	1	1	1
Children	2	2	2
Other Family	3	3	3
Friend/Neighbour	4	4	4
Project Staff	5	5	5
Community Agency	6	6	6
Other	7	7	7

3.6.d Do they (REFER TO SOURCE OF HELP) live:

In your unit	1	1	1
In your Bldg/Project	2	2	2
Outside of your Bldg/Project	3	3	3

3.6.e What kind of help did they give you:

1.
2.
3.

3.6.f In the past year, how often did you receive this help? Would you say:

4 times a wk or more	1	1	1
2 or 3 times a week	2	2	2
Once a week	3	3	3
1 to 3 times a month	4	4	4
Less than once a month	5	5	5
Other (SPECIFY)	6	6	6

3.6.g How long would you estimate you received (or have been getting) this help from _____?_ (PLEASE RECORD EXACT NUMBER OF DAYS, WEEKS, MONTHS OR YEARS/OR EXACT DATES)

Number of days, weeks months/or Dates	_____	_____	_____
	Source 1	Source 2	Source 3

3.6.h (INTERVIEWER PROBE THEN CODE IF HELP WAS...)

Once	1	1	1
On-going,regular	2	2	2
On-going,occassional	3	3	3
Time-limited	4	4	4

3.6.i Did you receive enough help?

Yes	1	1	1
No	2	2	2

Was it the right kind of help?

Yes	1	1	1
No	2	2	2

3.6.j How did you arrange for this help or service?

Myself	1	1	1
CRW	2	2	2
Public health nurse	3	3	3
Physician	4	4	4
Community group	5	5	5
Residential council	6	6	6
Relatives	7	7	7
Other (SPECIFY) --------------------	8	8	8

3.6.k Without help from (each source) would you have been able to get by with no difficulty, a little difficulty, a lot of difficulty, or not at all?

With no difficulty	1	1	1
A little difficulty	2	2	2
A lot of difficulty	3	3	3
Not at all	4	4	4

3.7 Thinking generally of how things have been for you in the past year, how much difficulty have you personally had bathing or showering on your own? Would you say:

1. No difficulty (GO TO Q.3.7.b)
2. A little difficulty
3. A lot of difficulty
4. Could not do at all by yourself
5. (Does not normally carry out this activity...GO TO Q.3.8)

3.7.a What was this difficulty?

3.7.b In the past year have you ever had help with bathing or showering?

1. Yes - (GO TO Q.3.7.c)
2. No

(IF RESPONDENT HAD NO DIFFICULTY AND NO HELP GO TO Q.3.8)
(IF RESPONDENT HAD DIFFICULTY AND NO HELP ASK:)

Could you have used some help?

1. No (GO TO Q.3.8)
2. Yes...Why aren't you getting help?

(GO TO Q.3.8)

3.7.c Who gave you this help? (CIRCLE CODES TO INDICATE EACH TYPE AND PROBE FOR OTHER HELP, "IS THERE ANYONE ELSE (OR ANY OTHER AGENCY) WHO HELPED YOU WITH...?" NOTE DETAILS) RECORD ANY AGENCIES USED ON AGENCY CARD.

	Source 1	Source 2	Source 3
Spouse/Housemate	1	1	1
Children	2	2	2
Other Family	3	3	3
Friend/Neighbour	4	4	4
Project Staff	5	5	5
Community Agency	6	6	6
Other	7	7	7

3.7.d Do they (REFER TO SOURCE OF HELP) live:

In your unit	1	1	1
In your Bldg/Project	2	2	2
Outside of your Bldg/Project	3	3	3

3.7.e What kind of help did they give you:

1. ---
2. ---
3. ---

3.7.f In the past year, how often did you receive this help? Would you say:

4 times a wk or more	1	1	1
2 or 3 times a week	2	2	2
Once a week	3	3	3
1 to 3 times a month	4	4	4
Less than once a month	5	5	5
Other (SPECIFY)	6	6	6

3.7.g How long would you estimate you received (or have been getting) this help from _____? (PLEASE RECORD EXACT NUMBER OF DAYS, WEEKS, MONTHS OR YEARS/OR EXACT DATES)

Number of days, weeks months/or Dates	_____	_____	_____
	Source 1	Source 2	Source 3

3.7.h (INTERVIEWER PROBE THEN CODE IF HELP WAS...)

Once	1	1	1
On-going,regular	2	2	2
On-going,occassional	3	3	3
Time-limited	4	4	4

3.7.i Did you receive enough help?

Yes	1	1	1
No	2	2	2

Was it the right kind of help?

Yes	1	1	1
No	2	2	2

3.7.j How did you arrange for this help or service?

Myself	1	1	1
CRW	2	2	2
Public health nurse	3	3	3
Physician	4	4	4
Community group	5	5	5
Residential council	6	6	6
Relatives	7	7	7
Other (SPECIFY) -------------------	8	8	8

3.7.k Without help from (each source) would you have been able to get by with no difficulty, a little difficulty, a lot of difficulty, or not at all?

With no difficulty	1	1	1
A little difficulty	2	2	2
A lot of difficulty	3	3	3
Not at all	4	4	4

3.8 Thinking generally of how things have been for you in the past year, how much difficulty have you personally had doing laundry on your own? Would you say:

1. No difficulty (GO TO Q.3.8.b)
2. A little difficulty
3. A lot of difficulty
4. Could not do at all by yourself
5. (Does not normally carry out this activity...GO TO Q.3.9)

3.8.a What was this difficulty?

____

3.8.b In the past year have you ever had help with doing laundry?

1. Yes - (GO TO Q.3.8.c)
2. No

(IF RESPONDENT HAD NO DIFFICULTY AND NO HELP GO TO Q.3.9)
(IF RESPONDENT HAD DIFFICULTY AND NO HELP ASK:)

Could you have used some help?

1. No (GO TO Q.3.9)
2. Yes...Why aren't you getting help?

____
(GO TO Q.3.9)

3.8.c Who gave you this help? (CIRCLE CODES TO INDICATE EACH TYPE AND PROBE FOR OTHER HELP, "IS THERE ANYONE ELSE (OR ANY OTHER AGENCY) WHO HELPED YOU WITH...?" NOTE DETAILS) RECORD ANY AGENCIES USED ON AGENCY CARD.

	Source 1	Source 2	Source 3
Spouse/Housemate	1	1	1
Children	2	2	2
Other Family	3	3	3
Friend/Neighbour	4	4	4
Project Staff	5	5	5
Community Agency	6	6	6
Other	7	7	7

3.8.d Do they (REFER TO SOURCE OF HELP) live:

In your unit	1	1	1
In your Bldg/Project	2	2	2
Outside of your Bldg/Project	3	3	3

3.8.e What kind of help did they give you:

1. --
2. --
3. --

3.8.f In the past year, how often did you receive this help? Would you say:

4 times a wk or more	1	1	1
2 or 3 times a week	2	2	2
Once a week	3	3	3
1 to 3 times a month	4	4	4
Less than once a month	5	5	5
Other (SPECIFY)	6	6	6

3.8.g How long would you estimate you received (or have been getting) this help from _____?_ (PLEASE RECORD EXACT NUMBER OF DAYS, WEEKS, MONTHS OR YEARS/OR EXACT DATES)

Number of days, weeks months/or Dates	_____	_____	_____
	Source 1	Source 2	Source 3

3.8.h (INTERVIEWER PROBE THEN CODE IF HELP WAS...)

Once	1	1	1
On-going, regular	2	2	2
On-going, occassional	3	3	3
Time-limited	4	4	4

3.8.i Did you receive enough help?

Yes	1	1	1
No	2	2	2

Was it the right kind of help?

Yes	1	1	1
No	2	2	2

3.8.j How did you arrange for this help or service?

Myself	1	1	1
CRW	2	2	2
Public health nurse	3	3	3
Physician	4	4	4
Community group	5	5	5
Residential council	6	6	6
Relatives	7	7	7
Other (SPECIFY) --------------------	8	8	8

3.8.k Without help from (each source) would you have been able to get by with no difficulty, a little difficulty, a lot of difficulty, or not at all?

With no difficulty	1	1	1
A little difficulty	2	2	2
A lot of difficulty	3	3	3
Not at all	4	4	4

3.9 How much difficulty have you had going up and down stairs in the past year? Would you say no difficulty, a little difficulty, a lot of difficulty or could not do it all by yourself.
(CIRCLE ONE)

1. No difficulty
2. A little difficulty
3. A lot of difficulty
4. Could not do at all by yourself
9. Not applicable

3.10 How much difficulty have you had using a telephone in the past year? Would you say no difficulty, a little difficulty, a lot of difficulty or could not do at all by yourself. (CIRCLE ONE)

1. No difficulty
2. A little difficulty
3. A lot of difficulty
4. Could not do at all by yourself
9. Not applicable

3.11 How much difficulty have you had cutting your toenails on your own in the past year? Would you say no difficulty, a little difficulty, a lot of difficulty or could not do at all by yourself. (CIRCLE ONE)

1. No difficulty
2. A little difficulty
3. A lot of difficulty
4. Could not do at all by yourself
9. Not applicable

4.0 We would like to talk with you about the services provided by organizations you may have already used and some services which might be of use to you.

(INTERVIEWER: WHILE PROCEEDING, PLEASE CHECK OFF THE SERVICES THAT THE RESPONDENT HAS ALREADY INDICATED RECEIVING IN THE QUESTIONNAIRE, MAKING REFERENCE TO THE COMMUNITY AGENCY CARD AND NOTING RELEVANT QUESTION NUMBER).

4.1 In the past year have you or any family member ever received help from: (READ TYPE OF AGENCY/SERVICE)

	Public Health Nurse or other nurses (e.g. V.O.N.)	**Physical Therapist**	**Occupational Therapist**
Yes, as noted in previous charts (GO TO NEXT SERVICE OR 4.2)	1	1	1
Yes, noted here	2	2	2
No...Have you ever heard of (MENTION SERVICE)	3	3	3
Yes... (GO TO NEXT SERVICE OR Q.4.2)	1	1	1
No ...	2	2	2

(IF YES) What kind of help/service was that? (SPECIFY SOURCE OF HELP AND KIND OF SERVICE: PROBE FOR ALL DETAILS: THEN ASK A - H QUESTIONS)

1. ____________________
____
2. ____________________
____
3. ____________________
____

4.1.a Who was the help/service for?

Self	1	1	1
Spouse/housemate	2	2	2
Child	3	3	3
Other (SPECIFY):	4	4	4

4.1.b Why did you get this help?

1. ____
2. ____
3. ____

4.1.c Where did you receive this help?

In Unit	1	1	1
In building/project	2	2	2
Out of building/project	3	3	3

4.1.d In the past year, how often did you receive this help/service? (CIRCLE ONE)

4 times a week or more	1	1	1
2 or 3 times a week	2	2	2
Once a week	3	3	3
1 to 3 times a month	4	4	4
Less than once a month	5	5	5

4.1.e How long would you estimate you have received or have been getting this help from _______?

(PROBE NUMBER OF DAYS, WEEKS, MONTHS AND DATES IF POSSIBLE)	____	____	____
	SOURCE1	SOURCE2	SOURCE3

4.1.f (INTERVIEWER PROBE AND CODE IF HELP/SERVICE WAS:)

Once	1	1	1
On-going,regular	2	2	2
On-going,occassional	3	3	3
Time-limited	4	4	4

4.1.g Did you receive enough help?

Yes	1	1	1
No	2	2	2

Was it the right kind of help?

Yes	1	1	1
No	2	2	2

4.1.h How did you arrange for this service?

Yourself	1	1	1
CRW	2	2	2
Public health nurse	3	3	3
Physician	4	4	4
Community group	5	5	5
Residential council	6	6	6
Relatives	7	7	7
Other (SPECIFY) ______________________	8	8	8

4.1.i Without this help/service, would you have been able to get by with no difficulty, a little difficulty, a lot of difficulty, or not at all?

With no difficulty	1	1	1
A little difficulty	2	2	2
A lot of difficulty	3	3	3
Not at all	4	4	4

4.2 In the past year have you or any family member ever received help from: (READ TYPE OF AGENCY/SERVICE)

	Homemaking/ Housekeeping Service	Meals on Wheels	Other Meal Services (Wheels to Meals,etc.)
Yes, as noted in previous charts (GO TO NEXT SERVICE OR 4.3)	1	1	1
Yes, noted here	2	2	2
No...Have you ever heard of (MENTION SERVICE)	3	3	3
Yes...(GO TO NEXT SERVICE OR	1	1	1
No ... Q.4.3)	2	2	2

(IF YES) What kind of help/ service was that? (SPECIFY SOURCE OF HELP AND KIND OF SERVICE: PROBE FOR ALL DETAILS: THEN ASK A - H QUESTIONS)

1. ____________________
____

2. ____________________
____

3. ____________________
____

4.2.a Who was the help/service for?

	Homemaking/ Housekeeping Service	Meals on Wheels	Other Meal Services (Wheels to Meals,etc.)
Self	1	1	1
Spouse/housemate	2	2	2
Child	3	3	3
Other (SPECIFY):	4	4	4

4.2.b Why did you get this help?

1. ____
2. ____
3. ____

4.2.c Where did you receive this help?

	Homemaking/ Housekeeping Service	Meals on Wheels	Other Meal Services (Wheels to Meals,etc.)
In Unit	1	1	1
In building/project	2	2	2
Out of building/project	3	3	3

4.2.d In the past year, how often did you receive this help/service? (CIRCLE ONE)

4 times a week or more	1	1	1
2 or 3 times a week	2	2	2
Once a week	3	3	3
1 to 3 times a month	4	4	4
Less than once a month	5	5	5

4.2.e How long would you estimate you have received or have been getting this help from _______?

(PROBE NUMBER OF DAYS, WEEKS, MONTHS AND DATES IF POSSIBLE)

____	____	____
SOURCE1	SOURCE2	SOURCE3

4.2.f (INTERVIEWER PROBE AND CODE IF HELP/SERVICE WAS:)

Once	1	1	1
On-going,regular	2	2	2
On-going,occassional	3	3	3
Time-limited	4	4	4

4.2.g Did you receive enough help?

Yes	1	1	1
No	2	2	2

Was it the right kind of help?

Yes	1	1	1
No	2	2	2

4.2.h How did you arrange for this service?

Yourself	1	1	1
CRW	2	2	2
Public health nurse	3	3	3
Physician	4	4	4
Community group	5	5	5
Residential council	6	6	6
Relatives	7	7	7
Other (SPECIFY) ______________________	8	8	8

4.2.i Without this help/service, would you have been able to get by with no difficulty, a little difficulty, a lot of difficulty, or not at all?

With no difficulty	1	1	1
A little difficulty	2	2	2
A lot of difficulty	3	3	3
Not at all	4	4	4

	Laundry Service	Footcare Clinic	Hearing Clinic
4.3 In the past year have you or any family member ever received help from: (READ TYPE OF AGENCY/SERVICE)			
Yes, as noted in previous charts (GO TO NEXT SERVICE OR 4.4)	1	1	1
Yes, noted here	2	2	2
No...Have you ever heard of (MENTION SERVICE)	3	3	3
Yes...(GO TO NEXT SERVICE OR	1	1	1
No ... Q.4.4)	2	2	2

(IF YES) What kind of help/service was that? (SPECIFY SOURCE OF HELP AND KIND OF SERVICE: PROBE FOR ALL DETAILS: THEN ASK A - H QUESTIONS)

1. ____________________
____
2. ____________________
____
3. ____________________
____

4.3.a Who was the help/service for?

Self	1	1	1
Spouse/housemate	2	2	2
Child	3	3	3
Other (SPECIFY):	4	4	4

4.3.b Why did you get this help?

1. ____
2. ____
3. ____

4.3.c Where did you receive this help?

In Unit	1	1	1
In building/project	2	2	2
Out of building/project	3	3	3

4.3.d In the past year, how often did you receive this help/service? (CIRCLE ONE)

4 times a week or more	1	1	1
2 or 3 times a week	2	2	2
Once a week	3	3	3
1 to 3 times a month	4	4	4
Less than once a month	5	5	5

4.3.e How long would you estimate you have received or have been getting this help from _______?

(PROBE NUMBER OF DAYS, WEEKS, MONTHS AND DATES IF POSSIBLE)

____	____	____
SOURCE1	SOURCE2	SOURCE3

4.3.f (INTERVIEWER PROBE AND CODE IF HELP/SERVICE WAS:)

Once	1	1	1
On-going,regular	2	2	2
On-going,occassional	3	3	3
Time-limited	4	4	4

4.3.g Did you receive enough help?

Yes	1	1	1
No	2	2	2

Was it the right kind of help?

Yes	1	1	1
No	2	2	2

4.3.h How did you arrange for this service?

Yourself	1	1	1
CRW	2	2	2
Public health nurse	3	3	3
Physician	4	4	4
Community group	5	5	5
Residential council	6	6	6
Relatives	7	7	7
Other (SPECIFY) ______________________	8	8	8

4.3.i Without this help/service, would you have been able to get by with no difficulty, a little difficulty, a lot of difficulty, or not at all?

With no difficulty	1	1	1
A little difficulty	2	2	2
A lot of difficulty	3	3	3
Not at all	4	4	4

	Vision Clinic	Dental Clinic	Day Care
4.4 In the past year have you or any family member ever received help from: (READ TYPE OF AGENCY/SERVICE)			
Yes, as noted in previous charts (GO TO NEXT SERVICE OR 4.5)	1	1	1
Yes, noted here	2	2	2
No...Have you ever heard of (MENTION SERVICE)	3	3	3
Yes...(GO TO NEXT SERVICE OR	1	1	1
No... Q.4.5)	2	2	2

(IF YES) What kind of help/ service was that? (SPECIFY SOURCE OF HELP AND KIND OF SERVICE: PROBE FOR ALL DETAILS: THEN ASK A - H QUESTIONS)

1. ____________________
____
2. ____________________
____
3. ____________________
____

4.4.a Who was the help/service for?

Self	1	1	1
Spouse/housemate	2	2	2
Child	3	3	3
Other (SPECIFY):	4	4	4

4.4.b Why did you get this help?

1. ____
2. ____
3. ____

4.4.c Where did you receive this help?

In Unit	1	1	1
In building/project	2	2	2
Out of building/project	3	3	3

4.4.d In the past year, how often did you receive this help/service? (CIRCLE ONE)

4 times a week or more	1	1	1
2 or 3 times a week	2	2	2
Once a week	3	3	3
1 to 3 times a month	4	4	4
Less than once a month	5	5	5

4.4.e How long would you estimate you have received or have been getting this help from _______?

(PROBE NUMBER OF DAYS, WEEKS, MONTHS AND DATES IF POSSIBLE)

	____ SOURCE1	____ SOURCE2	____ SOURCE3

4.4.f (INTERVIEWER PROBE AND CODE IF HELP/SERVICE WAS:)

Once	1	1	1
On-going,regular	2	2	2
On-going,occassional	3	3	3
Time-limited	4	4	4

4.4.g Did you receive enough help?

Yes	1	1	1
No	2	2	2

Was it the right kind of help?

Yes	1	1	1
No	2	2	2

4.4.h How did you arrange for this service?

Yourself	1	1	1
CRW	2	2	2
Public health nurse	3	3	3
Physician	4	4	4
Community group	5	5	5
Residential council	6	6	6
Relatives	7	7	7
Other (SPECIFY) ______________________	8	8	8

4.4.i Without this help/service, would you have been able to get by with no difficulty, a little difficulty, a lot of difficulty, or not at all?

With no difficulty	1	1	1
A little difficulty	2	2	2
A lot of difficulty	3	3	3
Not at all	4	4	4

	Day Hospital	Mental Health Services	Family Counselling Services
4.5 In the past year have you or any family member ever received help from: (READ TYPE OF AGENCY/SERVICE)			
Yes, as noted in previous charts (GO TO NEXT SERVICE OR 4.6)	1	1	1
Yes, noted here	2	2	2
No...Have you ever heard of (MENTION SERVICE)	3	3	3
Yes...(GO TO NEXT SERVICE OR	1	1	1
No ... Q.4.5)	2	2	2

(IF YES) What kind of help/ service was that? (SPECIFY SOURCE OF HELP AND KIND OF SERVICE: PROBE FOR ALL DETAILS: THEN ASK A - H QUESTIONS)

1. ____________________
____

2. ____________________
____

3. ____________________
____

4.5.a Who was the help/service for?

Self	1	1	1
Spouse/housemate	2	2	2
Child	3	3	3
Other (SPECIFY):	4	4	4

4.5.b Why did you get this help?

1. ____
2. ____
3. ____

4.5.c Where did you receive this help?

In Unit	1	1	1
In building/project	2	2	2
Out of building/project	3	3	3

4.5.d In the past year, how often did you receive this help/service? (CIRCLE ONE)

4 times a week or more	1	1	1
2 or 3 times a week	2	2	2
Once a week	3	3	3
1 to 3 times a month	4	4	4
Less than once a month	5	5	5

4.5.e How long would you estimate you have received or have been getting this help from _______?

(PROBE NUMBER OF DAYS, WEEKS, MONTHS AND DATES IF POSSIBLE)

	____	____	____
	SOURCE1	SOURCE2	SOURCE3

4.5.f (INTERVIEWER PROBE AND CODE IF HELP/SERVICE WAS:)

Once	1	1	1
On-going,regular	2	2	2
On-going,occassional	3	3	3
Time-limited	4	4	4

4.5.g Did you receive enough help?

Yes	1	1	1
No	2	2	2

Was it the right kind of help?

Yes	1	1	1
No	2	2	2

4.5.h How did you arrange for this service?

Yourself	1	1	1
CRW	2	2	2
Public health nurse	3	3	3
Physician	4	4	4
Community group	5	5	5
Residential council	6	6	6
Relatives	7	7	7
Other (SPECIFY) ______________________	8	8	8

4.5.i Without this help/service, would you have been able to get by with no difficulty, a little difficulty, a lot of difficulty, or not at all?

With no difficulty	1	1	1
A little difficulty	2	2	2
A lot of difficulty	3	3	3
Not at all	4	4	4

		Nutrition Counselling	Counselling about Drug or Alcohol Use	Friendly Visiting
4.6	In the past year have you or any family member ever received help from: (READ TYPE OF AGENCY/SERVICE)			
	Yes, as noted in previous charts (GO TO NEXT SERVICE OR 4.7)	1	1	1
	Yes, noted here	2	2	2
	No...Have you ever heard of (MENTION SERVICE)	3	3	3
	Yes...(GO TO NEXT SERVICE OR	1	1	1
	No... Q.4.7)	2	2	2

(IF YES) What kind of help/service was that? (SPECIFY SOURCE OF HELP AND KIND OF SERVICE: PROBE FOR ALL DETAILS: THEN ASK A - H QUESTIONS)

1. ____________________
____
2. ____________________
____
3. ____________________
____

4.6.a	Who was the help/service for?			
	Self	1	1	1
	Spouse/housemate	2	2	2
	Child	3	3	3
	Other (SPECIFY):	4	4	4

4.6.b Why did you get this help?

1. ____
2. ____
3. ____

4.6.c	Where did you receive this help?			
	In Unit	1	1	1
	In building/project	2	2	2
	Out of building/project	3	3	3

4.6.d In the past year, how often did you receive this help/service? (CIRCLE ONE)

4 times a week or more	1	1	1
2 or 3 times a week	2	2	2
Once a week	3	3	3
1 to 3 times a month	4	4	4
Less than once a month	5	5	5

4.6.e How long would you estimate you have received or have been getting this help from _______?

(PROBE NUMBER OF DAYS, WEEKS, MONTHS AND DATES IF POSSIBLE)	----	----	----

4.6.f (INTERVIEWER PROBE AND CODE IF HELP/SERVICE WAS:)

Once	1	1	1
On-going,regular	2	2	2
On-going,occassional	3	3	3
Time-limited	4	4	4

4.6.g Did you receive enough help?

Yes	1	1	1
No	2	2	2

Was it the right kind of help?

Yes	1	1	1
No	2	2	2

4.6.h How did you arrange for this service?

Yourself	1	1	1
CRW	2	2	2
Public health nurse	3	3	3
Physician	4	4	4
Community group	5	5	5
Residential council	6	6	6
Relatives	7	7	7
Other (SPECIFY) ______________________	8	8	8

4.6.i Without this help/service, would you have been able to get by with no difficulty, a little difficulty, a lot of difficulty, or not at all?

With no difficulty	1	1	1
A little difficulty	2	2	2
A lot of difficulty	3	3	3
Not at all	4	4	4

4.7 In the past year have you or any family member ever received help from: (READ TYPE OF AGENCY/SERVICE)

	Special Transportation (e.g. Project Lift)	Telephone, Security or Safety Check Services	Community Information and Referral Service
Yes, as noted in previous charts (GO TO NEXT SERVICE OR 4.8)	1	1	1
Yes, noted here	2	2	2
No...Have you ever heard of (MENTION SERVICE)	3	3	3
Yes...(GO TO NEXT SERVICE OR	1	1	1
No... Q.4.8)	2	2	2

(IF YES) What kind of help/ service was that? (SPECIFY SOURCE OF HELP AND KIND OF SERVICE: PROBE FOR ALL DETAILS: THEN ASK A - H QUESTIONS)

1. ____________________
____
2. ____________________
____
3. ____________________
____

4.7.a Who was the help/service for?

Self	1	1	1
Spouse/housemate	2	2	2
Child	3	3	3
Other (SPECIFY):	4	4	4

4.7.b Why did you get this help?

1. ____
2. ____
3. ____

4.7.c Where did you receive this help?

In Unit	1	1	1
In building/project	2	2	2
Out of building/project	3	3	3

4.7.d In the past year, how often did you receive this help/service? (CIRCLE ONE)

4 times a week or more	1	1	1
2 or 3 times a week	2	2	2
Once a week	3	3	3
1 to 3 times a month	4	4	4
Less than once a month	5	5	5

4.7.e How long would you estimate you have received or have been getting this help from _______?

(PROBE NUMBER OF DAYS, WEEKS, MONTHS AND DATES IF POSSIBLE)

	____	____	____
	SOURCE1	SOURCE2	SOURCE3

4.7.f (INTERVIEWER PROBE AND CODE IF HELP/SERVICE WAS:)

Once	1	1	1
On-going,regular	2	2	2
On-going,occassional	3	3	3
Time-limited	4	4	4

4.7.g Did you receive enough help?

Yes	1	1	1
No	2	2	2

Was it the right kind of help?

Yes	1	1	1
No	2	2	2

4.7.h How did you arrange for this service?

Yourself	1	1	1
CRW	2	2	2
Public health nurse	3	3	3
Physician	4	4	4
Community group	5	5	5
Residential council	6	6	6
Relatives	7	7	7
Other (SPECIFY)			
______________________	8	8	8

4.7.i Without this help/service, would you have been able to get by with no difficulty, a little difficulty, a lot of difficulty, or not at all?

With no difficulty	1	1	1
A little difficulty	2	2	2
A lot of difficulty	3	3	3
Not at all	4	4	4

	Housing Project Staff (CRW or other SPECIFY)	Recreational, Community,Care Drop In Centres	Legal Services (e.g. Legal Aid)
4.8 In the past year have you or any family member ever received help from: (READ TYPE OF AGENCY/SERVICE)			
Yes, as noted in previous charts (GO TO NEXT SERVICE OR 4.9)	1	1	1
Yes, noted here	2	2	2
No...Have you ever heard of (MENTION SERVICE)	3	3	3
Yes...(GO TO NEXT SERVICE OR	1	1	1
No... Q.4.9)	2	2	2

(IF YES) What kind of help/ service was that? (SPECIFY SOURCE OF HELP AND KIND OF SERVICE: PROBE FOR ALL DETAILS: THEN ASK A - H QUESTIONS)

1. ____________________
   ____
2. ____________________
   ____
3. ____________________
   ____

4.8.a Who was the help/service for?			
Self	1	1	1
Spouse/housemate	2	2	2
Child	3	3	3
Other (SPECIFY):	4	4	4

4.8.b Why did you get this help?

1. ____
2. ____
3. ____

4.8.c Where did you receive this help?			
In Unit	1	1	1
In building/project	2	2	2
Out of building/project	3	3	3

4.8.d In the past year, how often did you receive this help/service? (CIRCLE ONE)

4 times a week or more	1	1	1
2 or 3 times a week	2	2	2
Once a week	3	3	3
1 to 3 times a month	4	4	4
Less than once a month	5	5	5

4.8.e How long would you estimate you have received or have been getting this help from _______?

(PROBE NUMBER OF DAYS, WEEKS, MONTHS AND DATES IF POSSIBLE)

	____	____	____
	SOURCE1	SOURCE2	SOURCE3

4.8.f (INTERVIEWER PROBE AND CODE IF HELP/SERVICE WAS:)

Once	1	1	1
On-going,regular	2	2	2
On-going,occassional	3	3	3
Time-limited	4	4	4

4.8.g Did you receive enough help?

Yes	1	1	1
No	2	2	2

Was it the right kind of help?

Yes	1	1	1
No	2	2	2

4.8.h How did you arrange for this service?

Yourself	1	1	1
CRW	2	2	2
Public health nurse	3	3	3
Physician	4	4	4
Community group	5	5	5
Residential council	6	6	6
Relatives	7	7	7
Other (SPECIFY) ______________________	8	8	8

4.8.i Without this help/service, would you have been able to get by with no difficulty, a little difficulty, a lot of difficulty, or not at all?

With no difficulty	1	1	1
A little difficulty	2	2	2
A lot of difficulty	3	3	3
Not at all	4	4	4

4.9 In the past year have you or any family member ever received help from: (READ TYPE OF AGENCY/SERVICE)

	Credit/ Budget Counselling	1st Other Services	2nd Other Services
Yes, as noted in previous charts (GO TO NEXT SERVICE OR 4.10)	1	1	1
Yes, noted here	2	2	2
No...Have you ever heard of (MENTION SERVICE)	3	3	3
Yes...(GO TO NEXT SERVICE OR	1	1	1
No... Q.4.10)	2	2	2

(IF YES) What kind of help/ service was that? (SPECIFY SOURCE OF HELP AND KIND OF SERVICE: PROBE FOR ALL DETAILS: THEN ASK A - H QUESTIONS)

1. ____________________

____

2. ____________________

____

3. ____________________

____

4.9.a Who was the help/service for?

Self	1	1	1
Spouse/housemate	2	2	2
Child	3	3	3
Other (SPECIFY):	4	4	4

4.9.b Why did you get this help?

1. ____
2. ____
3. ____

4.9.c Where did you receive this help?

In Unit	1	1	1
In building/project	2	2	2
Out of building/project	3	3	3

4.9.d In the past year, how often did you receive this help/service? (CIRCLE ONE)

4 times a week or more	1	1	1
2 or 3 times a week	2	2	2
Once a week	3	3	3
1 to 3 times a month	4	4	4
Less than once a month	5	5	5

4.9.e How long would you estimate you have received or have been getting this help from _______?

(PROBE NUMBER OF DAYS, WEEKS, MONTHS AND DATES IF POSSIBLE)

	____	____	____
	SOURCE1	SOURCE2	SOURCE3

4.9.f (INTERVIEWER PROBE AND CODE IF HELP/SERVICE WAS:)

Once	1	1	1
On-going,regular	2	2	2
On-going,occassional	3	3	3
Time-limited	4	4	4

4.9.g Did you receive enough help?

Yes	1	1	1
No	2	2	2

Was it the right kind of help?

Yes	1	1	1
No	2	2	2

4.9.h How did you arrange for this service?

Yourself	1	1	1
CRW	2	2	2
Public health nurse	3	3	3
Physician	4	4	4
Community group	5	5	5
Residential council	6	6	6
Relatives	7	7	7
Other (SPECIFY) ______________________	8	8	8

4.9.i Without this help/service, would you have been able to get by with no difficulty, a little difficulty, a lot of difficulty, or not at all?

With no difficulty	1	1	1
A little difficulty	2	2	2
A lot of difficulty	3	3	3
Not at all	4	4	4

4.10 Thinking of all the things we've been discussing, are there any other services or help you or your spouse/housemate have needed, in the past year, but (PLEASE CHECK)

- haven't been able to get.
- or haven't asked for?

1. No (GO TO Q.5)
2. Yes

A. What did you need help with? (INSERT BELOW UNDER 'PROBLEM', THEN PROBE). Any other things you needed help with? (LIST AND ASK B AND C FOR EACH PROBLEM).

B. Why didn't you get this help you needed? (PROBE FOR ADDITIONAL REASONS).

(INSERT THESE CODES IN CHART BELOW):

1. Not aware of service
2. Service not available
3. Not sure what kind of service would help
4. Wouldn't ask for help
5. Cost too high
6. Not eligible
7. On waiting list
8. Inconvenient hours
9. Don't want
10. Lack of transportation
11. Service inappropriate
12. Difficult to get help on weekends
13. Other (SPECIFY): _______________

C. Have you been able to get along without such service? Would you say?:

1. With no difficulty
2. A little difficulty
3. A lot of difficulty
4. Not at all

A: PROBLEMS FOR WHICH NEEDS WERE NOT MET	B: REASON NOT GETTING HELP	C: HOW WELL GOT ALONG WITHOUT SERVICE

5.0 Now I would like to ask you about problems you might encounter, and what you would do if you needed help for those types of problems. (INTERVIEWER: FOR ALL 5.0 TO 5.8, IF MORE THAN ONE SOURCE OF HELP IN A SINGLE CATEGORY IS IDENTIFIED RANK 1 AND 2 AND 3 ETC. CIRCLE WHERE LOCATED. DO NOT PROBE FOR MORE THAN ONE SOURCE, BUT CODE IF GIVEN.)

5.1 If you were upset, nervous, or depressed and needed some help, whom would you most likely turn to? Does this person live in or outside your household?

	In Unit	In Project/ Building	Out
(a) ___ Friend	1	2	3
(b) ___ Neighbour	1	2	3
(c) ___ Spouse/Boy/Girl friend	1	2	3
(d) ___ Children	1	2	3
(e) ___ Other family	1	2	3
(f) ___ Building or project staff	1	2	3
(g) ___ Public or community agency	1	2	3
(h) ___ Other (specify)			
-------------------------	1	2	3
(i) ___ Don't know			
(j) ___ No one			

5.2 If you ran out of food, it was snowing and you needed help to get to the grocery store, whom would you most likely turn to? Does this person live in or outside your household?

	In Unit	In Project/ Building	Out
(a) ___ Friend	1	2	3
(b) ___ Neighbour	1	2	3
(c) ___ Spouse/Boy/Girl friend	1	2	3
(d) ___ Children	1	2	3
(e) ___ Other family	1	2	3
(f) ___ Building or project staff	1	2	3
(g) ___ Public or community agency	1	2	3
(h) ___ Other (specify)			
-------------------------	1	2	3
(i) ___ Don't know			
(j) ___ No one			

5.3 If you had an accident and needed someone to bathe you every day, whom would you most likely turn to?
Does this person live in or outside your household?

	In Unit	In Project/ Building	Out
(a) ___ Friend	1	2	3
(b) ___ Neighbour	1	2	3
(c) ___ Spouse/Boy/Girl friend	1	2	3
(d) ___ Children	1	2	3
(e) ___ Other family	1	2	3
(f) ___ Building or project staff	1	2	3
(g) ___ Public or community agency	1	2	3
(h) ___ Other (specify)			
-------------------------	1	2	3
(i) ___ Don't know			
(j) ___ No one			

5.4 If you did not have enough money to cover a large bill and needed help, whom would you most likely turn to?
Does this person live in or outside your household?

	In Unit	In Project/ Building	Out
(a) ___ Friend	1	2	3
(b) ___ Neighbour	1	2	3
(c) ___ Spouse/Boy/Girl friend	1	2	3
(d) ___ Children	1	2	3
(e) ___ Other family	1	2	3
(f) ___ Building or project staff	1	2	3
(g) ___ Public or community agency	1	2	3
(h) ___ Other (specify)			
-------------------------	1	2	3
(i) ___ Don't know			
(j) ___ No one			

5.5 If you needed help to get to a doctor's office or clinic, whom would you most likely turn to?
Does this person live in or outside your household?

	In Unit	In Project/ Building	Out
(a) ___ Friend	1	2	3
(b) ___ Neighbour	1	2	3
(c) ___ Spouse/Boy/Girl friend	1	2	3
(d) ___ Children	1	2	3
(e) ___ Other family	1	2	3
(f) ___ Building or project staff	1	2	3
(g) ___ Public or community agency	1	2	3
(h) ___ Other (specify)			
-------------------------	1	2	3
(i) ___ Don't know			
(j) ___ No one			

5.6 If you had a problem with your old age security cheque and felt you needed help dealing with the officials, whom would you most likely turn to help you?
Does this person live in or outside your household?

	In Unit	In Project/ Building	Out
(a) ___ Friend	1	2	3
(b) ___ Neighbour	1	2	3
(c) ___ Spouse/Boy/Girl friend	1	2	3
(d) ___ Children	1	2	3
(e) ___ Other family	1	2	3
(f) ___ Building or project staff	1	2	3
(g) ___ Public or community agency	1	2	3
(h) ___ Other (specify)			
_________________________	1	2	3
(i) ___ Don't know			
(j) ___ No one			

5.7 If you became seriously ill with the flu for a week and needed someone to help take care of you at home, whom would you most likely turn to?
Does this person live in or outside your household?

	In Unit	In Project/ Building	Out
(a) ___ Friend	1	2	3
(b) ___ Neighbour	1	2	3
(c) ___ Spouse/Boy/Girl friend	1	2	3
(d) ___ Children	1	2	3
(e) ___ Other family	1	2	3
(f) ___ Building or project staff	1	2	3
(g) ___ Public or community agency	1	2	3
(h) ___ Other (specify)			
_________________________	1	2	3
(i) ___ Don't know			
(j) ___ No one			

5.8 If you weren't supposed to do any housework for a couple of weeks (say for health reasons) whom would you most likely turn to? Does this person live in or outside your household?

	In Unit	In Project/ Building	Out
(a) ___ Friend	1	2	3
(b) ___ Neighbour	1	2	3
(c) ___ Spouse/Boy/Girl friend	1	2	3
(d) ___ Children	1	2	3
(e) ___ Other family	1	2	3
(f) ___ Building or project staff	1	2	3
(g) ___ Public or community agency	1	2	3
(h) ___ Other (specify)			
-------------------------	1	2	3
(i) ___ Don't know			
(j) ___ No one			

5.9 In an emergency is there someone who could provide you with immediate help?

1. Yes (IF YES) Who (SPECIFY): ________________
   Would this person/agency be providing help in or outside of the building or project?

   ___ In unit
   ___ In project/building
   ___ Out

2. No

5.10 Often people help each other out by doing things for each other such as sharing meals, checking on each other etc. Is there anything that you do to help others or that they do for you?

1. No
2. Share meals
3. Check on each other
4. Share advice or information
5. Help with housework or laundry
6. Shopping
7. Other (SPECIFY) _________________________

5.11 (IF YES) Do they live:

	Yes	No
1. In the building	1	2
2. In the project	1	2
3. Outside the project	1	2

Now I would like to ask you a few questions about your general health and medical services you may use.

6.1 Do you have a particular family doctor whom you call when you need medical care?

1. Yes...Where do you usually see this doctor?
    1. In the doctor's office
    2. Clinic in the project
    3. Clinic outside of project
    4. In your home
2. No (IF NO) What do you do if you need medical help? (PROBE: FOR EMERGENCY, CLINICS, ETC.)
    1. Go to emergency at hospital
    2. Go to clinic
    3. Other (SPECIFY) ____________________

6.2 When was the last time you visited a medical doctor about your health? (PROBE FOR: EMERGENCIES, OUT PATIENT, FAMILY DOCTOR, SPECIALIST)

1. Less than one year ago
2. More than one year ago (TO GO Q. 6.5)

6.3 During the past 12 months, have you been a patient in a hospital overnight?

1. ___ Yes (Approximately how many days? ____)
2. ___ No (GO TO Q. 6.5)

6.4 How many different times have you been admitted to hospital in the last year?

____ NUMBER Why? ____

____

____

6.5 Do you have any of the following health conditions at the present time?

(IF YES ASK:) How much does this interfere with your daily activities? Does it interfere not at all, a little (some), or a great deal?

	Yes	No	Not at All	A Little	A Great Deal
A. Arthritis or rheumatism	1	2	1	2	3
B. Glaucoma	1	2	1	2	3
C. Asthma, Emphysema or Chronic bronchitis	1	2	1	2	3
D. High blood pressure heart trouble or the effects of a stroke	1	2	1	2	3
E. Circulation trouble in arms or legs	1	2	1	2	3
F. Diabetes	1	2	1	2	3
G. Ulcers and other stomach or intestinal disorders or gall bladder problems	1	2	1	2	3
H. Liver disease	1	2	1	2	3
I. Kidney and other urinary tract disorders (including prostate trouble)	1	2	1	2	3
J. Cancer or leukemia	1	2	1	2	3
K. Anemia	1	2	1	2	3
L. Parkinson's disease	1	2	1	2	3
M. Epilepsy	1	2	1	2	3
N. Cerebral palsy, multiple sclerosis or muscular distrophy	1	2	1	2	3
O. Effects of polio	1	2	1	2	3
P. Thyroid or other glandular disorders	1	2	1	2	3
Q. Any others (SPECIFY) ________________________	1	2	1	2	3

6.6 How would you rate your overall health at the present time? Is it: (READ CHOICES AND CHECK ONE)

1. Excellent
2. Good
3. Fair
4. Poor
5. DON'T KNOW

6.7 Overall, how much do your health problems (IF ANY) stand in the way of your doing the things you want to do? Would you say: (READ CHOICES AND CIRCLE ONE)

1. Not at all
2. A little
3. A great deal
4. No health problem

(IF LIVES WITH SPOUSE/HOUSEMATE ASK 6.8, IF NOT GO TO Q.7.0)

6.8 And how much do your spouse/housemate's health problems (IF ANY) affect your ability to do the things you want to do? (READ AND CIRCLE ONE)

1. Not at all
2. A little
3. A great deal
4. No health problems

7.0 We need to have some idea how people manage financially, since that is an important part of people's lives.

7.1 Approximately how much is your total household monthly income?
(INTERVIEWER: CHECK THAT TOTAL INCLUDES ALL SOURCES OF INCOME FROM ALL HOUSEHOLD MEMBERS)

$_____________

7.2 How often do you have difficulty finding enough money each month to buy food and pay rent?
Would you say: (READ CHOICES AND CHECK ONE)

1. Rarely
2. Occasionally
3. Regularly
4. Never

7.3 What is the highest grade of school (or equivalent) that you ever completed? (ALSO ASK IF SPOUSE/HOUSEMATE)

	Respondent	Spouse/ Housemate
No schooling	---	---
Highest grade from 1 to 13 (INSERT GRADE NUMBER)	---	---
Other (SPECIFY): _____________	---	---

____

7.4 Were you born in Canada? (CHECK YES OR NO)

1. Yes
2. No (IF NO) Where were you born?

____

When did you first come to Canada?

____

7.5 What language do you use all or most of the time?

1. English
2. French
3. Other (SPECIFY) ________________

7.6 What (IF ANYTHING) do you feel the local housing authority should do to improve things in this project? (SPECIFY)_________________________________

____

____

7.7 Do you have any other comments about your situation which you would like to make?

____

____

____

____

Thank you for your help and assistance with this important study.

QUESTIONNAIRE FOR FRONT LINE STAFF
OF HEALTH, SOCIAL SERVICE AND OTHER COMMUNITY AGENCIES
WHO ARE FAMILIAR WITH TARGET HOUSING PROJECTS

A STUDY OF THE NEED AND USE PATTERNS OF
SUPPORT SERVICES AMONG PUBLIC HOUSING TENANTS

QUESTIONNAIRE FOR FRONT LINE STAFF OF HEALTH, SOCIAL SERVICE AND OTHER COMMUNITY AGENCIES WHO ARE FAMILIAR WITH TARGET HOUSING PROJECTS

A STUDY OF THE NEED AND USE PATTERNS OF SUPPORT SERVICES AMONG PUBLIC HOUSING TENANTS

This questionnaire relates to your own knowledge regarding the following public housing project and the community services that are provided to that project. We will refer to this project from time to time as THE FOCUS HOUSING PROJECT.

Project Name: ______________________________

Project Address: ______________________________
(Street Name and Number) (City/Borough/Town)

____

We are conducting a study for the Ontario Ministries of Municipal Affairs and Housing, Community and Social Services, and Health, and Canada Mortgage and Housing Corporation, on community services and needs of public housing tenants.

The purpose of this study is to increase our understanding as to how senior citizens and families with children, residing in public housing, find help for the kinds of needs that all seniors and families have from time to time. One part of the study calls for a review of available services, and a brief questionnaire to be filled out by agency/organization staff familiar with the projects we are studying.

You were identified as the appropriate respondent knowledgeable about this project and community services by the director of your agency/organization.

The questionnaire is divided into five sections: neighbourhood location and access; needs and support services availability; your role (and agency/organization role) as a service provider in the project and area; general trends and community-wide aspects of services. In answering the questionnaire, if you are unable to give an exact answer to some questions, please provide your best assessment or estimate as to what the answer would be. Also, if in some cases you do not know the answer to a question, please feel free to indicate that as well, since not everyone can be expected to have answers to the wide range of questions we are asking. Please add any extra comments you would like to make.

The survey is strictly confidential, and YOUR ANSWERS WILL NEVER BE SEEN BY ANYONE OTHER THAN OUR RESEARCHERS. NO ONE WILL SEE YOUR ANSWERS, NOT EVEN THE GOVERNMENT MINISTRIES THAT HAVE COMMISSIONED US TO DO THE SURVEY.

Name of respondent(s): ______________ Title: ______________

Telephone number(s): ______________________________

Address: ______________________________

Agency/organization: ______________________________

PRECODED INFORMATION

_ _ _ _ _ _ _
OH/FP Number (7 digits)

_ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _
R.C. Number (11 digits)

_ _ _
CMHC Number

SECTION 1: NEIGHBOURHOOD LOCATION, QUALITY OF LIFE AND ACCESS

This section of the questionnaire is designed to obtain information regarding the neighbourhood in which the focus project is located, and related matters.

1. We would like to know what type of neighbourhood the focus project is located in. Would you say it is located: (READ CHOICES AND RANK "1", "2", "3", ETC. IF MORE THAN ONE APPLIES)

   (a) ___ In a commercial area
   (b) ___ In a semi-industrial area
   (c) ___ In an older residential area
   (d) ___ In a residential area that is mainly single family homes
   (e) ___ In a residential area that is mainly apartments or townhouses
   (f) ___ In a semi-rural area on the outskirts of town
   (g) ___ Other (specify): ______________________________
   (h) ___ Don't know

2. How would you describe the kinds of people who live in the surrounding neighbourhood? (READ CHOICES AND RANK "1", "2", "3", ETC. IF MORE THAN ONE APPLIES)

   (a) ___ Many older retired people (seniors or older couples)
   (b) ___ Many families with teenage children
   (c) ___ Many families with young children
   (d) ___ Many single parent families
   (e) ___ Many single people
   (f) ___ Many transients
   (g) ___ Many ethnic
   (h) ___ Other (specify): ______________________________
   (i) ___ Don't know

3. How would you describe the socio-economic level of households in this neighbourhood? (CIRCLE ONE NUMBER)

   1. Largely middle income
   2. Combination of middle income and low income
   3. Mostly low income

4. How would you rate this neighbourhood as a place for the tenants to live? Would you say that each of the following aspects of the neighbourhood: is excellent, very good, good, fair or poor? (CIRCLE ONE NUMBER FOR EACH OF (a) TO (o))

	Excl.	Very Good	Good	Fair	Poor	Don't Know
(a) Condition of other housing and buildings in your neighbourhood	1	2	3	4	5	6
(b) Parks and playgrounds nearby	1	2	3	4	5	6
(c) Local shopping nearby	1	2	3	4	5	6
(d) Church or synagogue	1	2	3	4	5	6
(e) Amount of noise from traffic, trains, planes, and industry and things like that	1	2	3	4	5	6
(f) Quality of air - amount of pollution, dirt and fumes in the air	1	2	3	4	5	6
(g) Safety from crime against property	1	2	3	4	5	6
(h) Schools	1	2	3	4	5	6
(i) Recreation and other facilities in the neighbourhood	1	2	3	4	5	6
(j) Public Transit	1	2	3	4	5	6
(k) Safety to go out in the neighbourhood at night	1	2	3	4	5	6
(l) Safety to go out in the neighbourhood in the day	1	2	3	4	5	6
(m) Safety for children	1	2	3	4	5	6
(n) Community services like libraries, day care, social agencies	1	2	3	4	5	6
(o) Safety from violence against people	1	2	3	4	5	6

5. (a) How accessible would you say this project is to public transit? (CIRCLE ONE NUMBER)

1. No public transit in this area (GO TO Q.5(c))
2. Within one or two blocks
3. Within five blocks
4. More than five blocks away
5. Don't know

5. (b) How frequently is public transit service available here? (CIRCLE ONE NUMBER)

1. Frequent
2. Infrequent
3. Don't know

5. (c) How difficult is it to get around in this neighbourhood or community? (CIRCLE ONE)

1. Very difficult
2. Fairly difficult
3. A little difficult
4. Not difficult at all

6. Now we would like to find out about the kinds of facilities available to tenants from this project in the surrounding neighbourhood.

For each of the following (a) to (ab) please indicate if they are within easy walking distance (4 blocks), easy transit, difficult transit, or not available at all. (CIRCLE ONE ANSWER FOR EACH OF (a) TO (ab))

	Easy Walking	Easy Transit	Difficult Transit	Not Available At All	Don't Know
(a) Parks	1	2	3	4	5
(b) Playgrounds for young children (tot lots, wading pools, swings/slides)	1	2	3	4	5
(c) Play areas for children 5 - 12	1	2	3	4	5
(d) Baseball parks, football, hockey, basketball facilities	1	2	3	4	5
(e) Arenas	1	2	3	4	5
(f) Pools	1	2	3	4	5
(g) Senior Citizen Centre	1	2	3	4	5

	Easy Walking	Easy Transit	Difficult Transit	Not Available At all	Don't Know
(h) Seniors' Activities, Bingo halls, Seniors' Clubs, etc.	1	2	3	4	5
(i) Commercial recreation facilities (e.g. movies, bowling)	1	2	3	4	5
(j) Community Centres (YM/YWCA, municipal recreation centres, etc.)	1	2	3	4	5
(k) Library	1	2	3	4	5
(l) Corner store/convenience store	1	2	3	4	5
(m) Shopping centre/area	1	2	3	4	5
(n) Drugstore	1	2	3	4	5
(o) A doctor's office	1	2	3	4	5
(p) Hospital emergency	1	2	3	4	5
(q) Medical clinics	1	2	3	4	5
(r) Bank	1	2	3	4	5
(s) Post office	1	2	3	4	5
(t) Church/synagogue	1	2	3	4	5
(u) Restaurant/coffee shop	1	2	3	4	5
(v) Tavern/bar	1	2	3	4	5
(w) Pre-school Child care	1	2	3	4	5
(x) School-age Child care (lunch and after school)	1	2	3	4	5
(y) Schools (junior)	1	2	3	4	5
(z) Schools (high)	1	2	3	4	5
(aa) Summer only programs (day camp, excursions, etc.)	1	2	3	4	5
(ab) Are there any other services or facilities that the tenants use in the surrounding neighbourhood? (specify):					
____________________	1	2	3	4	5
____________________	1	2	3	4	5

SECTION 2: NEEDS OF PEOPLE IN THE PROJECT

7. Does your agency/organization provide services to senior citizens, families with children, or both? (CIRCLE ONE NUMBER)

    1. Senior citizens (ANSWER QUESTION 8)
    2. Families with children (ANSWER QUESTION 9)
    3. Both (ANSWER QUESTIONS 8 AND 9)

Now we have a few questions about needs of people who live in the project.

8. On the whole, how serious are the following problems for senior citizen tenants of the project? (CIRCLE ONE NUMBER FOR EACH OF (a) TO (1))

	Very serious	Fairly serious	Some-what serious	Not too serious	No problem at all	Don't know
(a) Inadequate incomes	1	2	3	4	5	6
(b) Inability to manage money	1	2	3	4	5	6
(c) Homemaking, housekeeping	1	2	3	4	5	6
(d) Getting around the city/ transportation	1	2	3	4	5	6
(e) Abuse of alcohol	1	2	3	4	5	6
(f) Abuse of drugs/substances	1	2	3	4	5	6
(g) Being isolated/lonely	1	2	3	4	5	6
(h) Getting adequate meals/ nutrition	1	2	3	4	5	6
(i) Poor physical health	1	2	3	4	5	6
(j) Overuse of medical facilities	1	2	3	4	5	6
(k) Fear of crime (never going out of apts.)	1	2	3	4	5	6
(1) Any other serious problems for seniors (specify): ________________	1	2	3	4	5	6

(IF PROVIDING SERVICES TO SENIORS ONLY, GO TO QUESTION 10)

9. On the whole, how serious are the following problems for family tenants of the project? (CIRCLE ONE NUMBER FOR EACH OF (a) TO (y))

	Very serious	Fairly serious	Somewhat serious	Not too serious	No problem at all	Don't know
(a) Inadequate incomes	1	2	3	4	5	6
(b) Inability to manage money	1	2	3	4	5	6
(c) Homemaking, housekeeping	1	2	3	4	5	6
(d) Getting around the city/ transportation	1	2	3	4	5	6
(e) Abuse of alcohol	1	2	3	4	5	6
(f) Abuse of drugs/substances	1	2	3	4	5	6
(g) Being isolated/lonely	1	2	3	4	5	6
(h) Getting adequate meals/ nutrition	1	2	3	4	5	6
(i) Poor physical health	1	2	3	4	5	6
(j) Lack of parenting skills	1	2	3	4	5	6
(k) Helping children with schoolwork	1	2	3	4	5	6
(l) Disciplining, controlling children	1	2	3	4	5	6
(m) Getting along with the family	1	2	3	4	5	6
(n) Dealing with family problems/ crises	1	2	3	4	5	6
(o) Family violence	1	2	3	4	5	6
(p) Neighbourhood violence	1	2	3	4	5	6
(q) Delinquency of children/youth	1	2	3	4	5	6
(r) Lack of employment for parents	1	2	3	4	5	6
(s) Lack of employment for youth	1	2	3	4	5	6
(t) Lack of skills to obtain employment	1	2	3	4	5	6
(u) Lack of motivation to find employment	1	2	3	4	5	6
(v) Inability to deal with agencies/organizations	1	2	3	4	5	6
(w) Lack of information about programs	1	2	3	4	5	6
(x) Failure to recognize own need for help	1	2	3	4	5	6
(y) Any other serious problems for families (specify): ________________	1	2	3	4	5	6

10. Overall, would you describe the focus housing project as having: (CIRCLE ONE NUMBER)

    1. Many serious problems
    2. Combinations of many minor problems which constitute a major problem
    3. Only occasional problems/crises which are soon over

11. Overall, would you rate the level of all social services provided to the residents of this project as: (CIRCLE ONE NUMBER)

    1. Excellent
    2. Fair
    3. Poor
    4. Very poor

12. Considering variations in needs, would you say that needs of people in the project are met more effectively, about the same, or less effectively than the needs of people in surrounding neighbourhoods? (CIRCLE ONE NUMBER)

    1. More effectively
    2. About the same
    3. Less effectively

(IF "MORE" OR "LESS", PLEASE EXPLAIN WHY)

13. Apart from formal community agencies and other organizations, informal sources of help may be very important to people.

In general, how much would you say that the following help people in this project with needs and problems?
(CIRCLE ONE NUMBER FOR EACH OF (a) TO (f))

	A Great deal	A Fair amount	Only a little	Not at all	Don't know
(a) Family	1	2	3	4	5
(b) Neighbours	1	2	3	4	5
(c) Churches	1	2	3	4	5
(d) Schools	1	2	3	4	5
(e) Residents' associations	1	2	3	4	5
(f) Self-help groups (e.g. informal groups meeting together for mutual support and assistance)	1	2	3	4	5

SECTION 3: SUPPORT SERVICES AVAILABLE TO TENANTS FROM COMMUNITY AGENCIES

Now we would like to ask you about the types of community services that are provided by various agencies/organizations to people who live in the focus housing projects. First we would like to find out if the services are available, and second, reasons (if applicable) why any needs are not met.

(IF SERVICES TO SENIORS ONLY, ANSWER QUESTIONS 14, 15, and 16)
(IF FAMILIES ONLY, ANSWER QUESTIONS 17, 18 and 19)
(IF SENIORS AND FAMILIES (MIXED) ANSWER QUESTIONS 14 TO 19, ALL QUESTIONS)

14. (a) (AVAILABILITY QUESTION) First we would like to know about availability of services. By availability, we mean that people who need services can get them, and that housing staff and social agencies can make referrals for services when they are needed. Would you say that the following services, listed as (a) to (y) are: (CIRCLE ONE ANSWER FOR EACH OF (a) TO (y))

FOR SENIOR CITIZENS	Available & meets the needs of most recipients	Available & meets the needs of some recipients	Available & meets the needs of only a few recipients	Not available	Don't Know
(a) Public health nurse	1	2	3	4	5
(b) Physical therapist	1	2	3	4	5
(c) Occupational therapist	1	2	3	4	5
(d) Homemaking/housekeeping service	1	2	3	4	5
(e) Meals on Wheels	1	2	3	4	5
(f) Other meal services	1	2	3	4	5
(g) Laundry service	1	2	3	4	5
(h) Footcare clinic	1	2	3	4	5
(i) Hearing clinic	1	2	3	4	5
(j) Vision clinic	1	2	3	4	5
(k) Dental clinic	1	2	3	4	5
(l) Day care clinic	1	2	3	4	5
(m) Day hospital	1	2	3	4	5
(n) Mental health services	1	2	3	4	5
(o) Family counselling services	1	2	3	4	5
(p) Nutrition counselling	1	2	3	4	5
(q) Counselling about drug or alcohol use	1	2	3	4	5
(r) Friendly visiting	1	2	3	4	5
(s) Special transportation	1	2	3	4	5
(t) Telephone, security or safety check services	1	2	3	4	5
(u) Community information and referral services	1	2	3	4	5
(v) Housing project staff	1	2	3	4	5
(w) Recreational community care, drop in centres	1	2	3	4	5
(x) Legal services	1	2	3	4	5
(y) Credit/budget counselling	1	2	3	4	5

(z) Are there any other important types of services that we have not listed that are available or unavailable to senior citizen residents of the project? (SPECIFY AND CIRCLE CODES FOR AVAILABILITY AND REASONS NOT MET)

____________________	1	2	3	4	5
____________________	1	2	3	4	5

14. (b) (REASONS NEEDS NOT MET QUESTION)

Answer this question for those items in which a "3" or "4" are given as answers to AVAILABILITY QUESTION 14(a).

Which are the main factors that account for the inability of the (specific) service to meet needs?

(CIRCLE ALL THAT APPLY)

	Services need to be provided more freq-uently/ regul ly	Need to serve more people/ demand too great	Wait-ing time for service too long	Costs to users are too high	Tenants unaware of services	Stigma attach-ed to seeking help	Other causes (please specify)
FOR SENIOR CITIZENS							
(a) Public health nurse	1	2	3	4	5	6	7________
(b) Physical therapist	1	2	3	4	5	6	7________
(c) Occupational therapist	1	2	3	4	5	6	7________
(d) Homemaking/housekeeping service	1	2	3	4	5	6	7________
(e) Meals on Wheels	1	2	3	4	5	6	7________
(f) Other meal services	1	2	3	4	5	6	7________
(g) Laundry service	1	2	3	4	5	6	7________
(h) Footcare clinic	1	2	3	4	5	6	7________
(i) Hearing clinic	1	2	3	4	5	6	7________
(j) Vision clinic	1	2	3	4	5	6	7________
(k) Dental clinic	1	2	3	4	5	6	7________
(l) Day care clinic	1	2	3	4	5	6	7________
(m) Day hospital	1	2	3	4	5	6	7________
(n) Mental health services	1	2	3	4	5	6	7________
(o) Family counselling services	1	2	3	4	5	6	7________
(p) Nutrition counselling	1	2	3	4	5	6	7________
(q) Counselling about drug or alcohol use	1	2	3	4	5	6	7________
(r) Friendly visiting	1	2	3	4	5	6	7________
(s) Special transportation	1	2	3	4	5	6	7________
(t) Telephone, security or safety check services	1	2	3	4	5	6	7________
(u) Community information and referral services	1	2	3	4	5	6	7________
(v) Housing project staff	1	2	3	4	5	6	7________
(w) Recreational community care, drop in centres	1	2	3	4	5	6	7________
(x) Legal services	1	2	3	4	5	6	7________
(y) Credit/budget counselling	1	2	3	4	5	6	7________

(z) Are there any other important types of services that we have not listed that are available or unavailable to senior citizen residents of the project? (SPECIFY AND CIRCLE CODES FOR AVAILABILITY AND REASONS NOT MET)

________________________	1	2	3	4	5	6	7________
________________________	1	2	3	4	5	6	7________

Now we are interested in finding out whether services are used more or less by seniors in the focus project than by seniors in the community generally.

15. Are these types of services used more, the same, or less by seniors in this project than in the community in general?
(CIRCLE ONE ANSWER TO EACH OF (a) THROUGH (y))

	Used More	Same	Used Less
FOR SENIOR CITIZENS			
(a) Public health nurse	1	2	3
(b) Physical therapist	1	2	3
(c) Occupational therapist	1	2	3
(d) Homemaking/housekeeping service	1	2	3
(e) Meals on Wheels	1	2	3
(f) Other meal services	1	2	3
(g) Laundry service	1	2	3
(h) Footcare clinic	1	2	3
(i) Hearing clinic	1	2	3
(j) Vision clinic	1	2	3
(k) Dental clinic	1	2	3
(l) Day care clinic	1	2	3
(m) Day hospital	1	2	3
(n) Mental health services	1	2	3
(o) Family counselling services	1	2	3
(p) Nutrition counselling	1	2	3
(q) Counselling about drug or alcohol use	1	2	3
(r) Friendly visiting	1	2	3
(s) Special transportation	1	2	3
(t) Telephone, security or safety check services	1	2	3
(u) Community information and referral services	1	2	3
(v) Housing project staff	1	2	3
(w) Recreational community care, drop in centres	1	2	3
(x) Legal services	1	2	3
(y) Credit/budget counselling	1	2	3
(z) Other (specify from question 14(z)			
____________________	1	2	3
____________________	1	2	3

16. (a) Considering the services being provided to senior citizen tenants of the focus housing project, which five services would you say are the most important to them? What service or help does each provide? And can you name a contact person at each service who would be knowledgeable about the project and area?
(LIST TOP 5, AND CONTACT PERSON AND TELEPHONE NUMBER IF KNOWN)

	Agency/Organization	Service Provided	Full Name of Contact Person and Telephone Number
1.			
2.			
3.			
4.			
5.			

(b) Are there any special projects, self-help groups or clubs which play a major role in this project by providing important services or supports to seniors? What service or help does each provide? Can you name a contact person knowledgeable about this project or self-help group?

Special Projects/ Self-Help Groups	Service Provided	Full Name of Contact Person and Telephone Number

(IF SENIORS ONLY SERVICES ARE PROVIDED BY YOU TO THIS PROJECT, GO TO QUESTION 20)

SERVICES FOR FAMILIES

17. (a) (AVAILABILITY QUESTION) Firstly, we would like to know about availability of services. By availability, we mean that people who need services can get them, and that housing staff and social agencies can make referrals for services when they are needed. Would you say that the following services, listed as (a) to (x) are: (CIRCLE ONE ANSWER FOR EACH OF (a) TO (x))

FOR FAMILIES	Available & meets the needs of most recipients	Available & meets the needs of some recipients	Available & meets the needs of only a few recipients	Not available	Don't Know
(a) Health services	1	2	3	4	5
(b) School social workers	1	2	3	4	5
(c) Homemaker service	1	2	3	4	5
(d) Mental health services for adults	1	2	3	4	5
(e) Mental health services for children	1	2	3	4	5
(f) Pre-school child day care program	1	2	3	4	5
(g) Before and after school child care program	1	2	3	4	5
(h) Police	1	2	3	4	5
(i) Childrens' Aid Society	1	2	3	4	5
(j) Parenting education	1	2	3	4	5
(k) Family planning (birth control) service	1	2	3	4	5
(l) Family counselling service	1	2	3	4	5
(m) Big Brothers/Big Sisters	1	2	3	4	5
(n) Credit/budget counselling	1	2	3	4	5
(o) Job counselling	1	2	3	4	5
(p) Educational upgrading program	1	2	3	4	5
(q) Nutrition counselling service	1	2	3	4	5
(r) Alcohol and drug counselling service	1	2	3	4	5
(s) Community information and referral services	1	2	3	4	5
(t) Counselling on family law matters	1	2	3	4	5
(u) Housing project staff	1	2	3	4	5
(v) Family benefits workers	1	2	3	4	5
(w) Other income maintenance	1	2	3	4	5
(x) Recreational/community drop in centres	1	2	3	4	5

(y) Are there any other important types of services that we have not listed that are available or unavailable to familes of the project? (SPECIFY AND CIRCLE CODES FOR AVAILABILITY AND REASONS NOT MET)

____________________	1	2	3	4	5
____________________	1	2	3	4	5

17. (b) (REASONS NEEDS NOT MET QUESTION)
Answer this question for those items in which a "3" or "4" are given as answers to AVAILABILITY QUESTION 17(a).

Which are the main factors that account for the inability of the (specific) service to meet needs?
(CIRCLE ALL THAT APPLY)

FOR FAMILIES	Services need to be provided more freq-uently/ regular-ly	Need to serve more people/ demand too great	Wait-ing time for service too long	Costs to users are too high	Tenants unaware of services	Stigma attach-ed to seeking help	Other causes (please specify)
(a) Health services	1	2	3	4	5	6	7______
(b) School social workers	1	2	3	4	5	6	7______
(c) Homemaker service	1	2	3	4	5	6	7______
(d) Mental health services for adults	1	2	3	4	5	6	7______
(e) Mental health services for children	1	2	3	4	5	6	7______
(f) Pre-school child day care program	1	2	3	4	5	6	7______
(g) Before and after school child care program	1	2	3	4	5	6	7______
(h) Police	1	2	3	4	5	6	7______
(i) Childrens' Aid Society	1	2	3	4	5	6	7______
(j) Parenting education	1	2	3	4	5	6	7______
(k) Family planning (birth control) service	1	2	3	4	5	6	7______
(l) Family counselling service	1	2	3	4	5	6	7______
(m) Big Brothers/Big Sisters	1	2	3	4	5	6	7______
(n) Credit/budget counselling	1	2	3	4	5	6	7______
(o) Job counselling	1	2	3	4	5	6	7______
(p) Educational upgrading program	1	2	3	4	5	6	7______
(q) Nutrition counselling service	1	2	3	4	5	6	7______
(r) Alcohol and drug counselling service	1	2	3	4	5	6	7______
(s) Community information and referral services	1	2	3	4	5	6	7______
(t) Counselling on family law matters	1	2	3	4	5	6	7______
(u) Housing project staff	1	2	3	4	5	6	7______
(v) Family benefits workers	1	2	3	4	5	6	7______
(w) Other income maintenance	1	2	3	4	5	6	7______
(x) Recreational/community drop in centres	1	2	3	4	5	6	7______

(y) Are there any other important types of services that we have not listed that are available or unavailable to families of the project?
(SPECIFY AND CIRCLE CODES FOR AVAILABILITY AND REASONS NOT MET)

______________________	1	2	3	4	5	6	7______
______________________	1	2	3	4	5	6	7______

Now we are interested in finding out whether services are used more or less by families in the focus project than by families in the community.

18. Are any of these types of services used more or less by family tenants in this project than in the community in general?
(CIRCLE ONE ANSWER FOR EACH OF (a) TO (y))

SERVICES FOR FAMILIES	Used More	Same	Used Less
(a) Health services	1	2	3
(b) School social workers	1	2	3
(c) Homemaker service	1	2	3
(d) Mental health services for adults	1	2	3
(e) Mental health services for children	1	2	3
(f) Pre-school child day care program	1	2	3
(g) Before and after school child care program	1	2	3
(h) Police	1	2	3
(i) Childrens' Aid Society	1	2	3
(j) Parenting education	1	2	3
(k) Family planning (birth control) service	1	2	3
(l) Family counselling service	1	2	3
(m) Big Brothers/Big Sisters	1	2	3
(n) Credit/budget counselling	1	2	3
(o) Job counselling	1	2	3
(p) Educational upgrading program	1	2	3
(q) Nutrition counselling service	1	2	3
(r) Alcohol and drug counselling service	1	2	3
(s) Community information and referral services	1	2	3
(t) Counselling on family law matters	1	2	3
(u) Housing project staff	1	2	3
(v) Family benefits workers	1	2	3
(w) Other income maintenance	1	2	3
(x) Recreational/community drop in centres	1	2	3
(y) Other services (specify):			
______________________	1	2	3
______________________	1	2	3

19. (a) Considering the services being provided to family residents of the focus housing project, which five services would you say are the most important to them? What service or help does each provide? And can you name a contact person at each service who would be knowledgeable about the project and area?
(LIST TOP 5, AND CONTACT PERSON AND TELEPHONE NUMBER IF KNOWN) .

	Agency/Organization	Service Provided	Full Name of Contact Person and Telephone Number
1.			
2.			
3.			
4.			
5.			

(b) Are there any special projects , self-help groups or clubs which play a major role in this project by providing important services or support to family tenants? What service or help does each provide? Can you name a contact person knowledgeable about this project or self-help group?

Special Projects/ Self-Help Groups	Service Provided	Full Name of Contact Person and Telephone Number

20. Why do some tenants not use services they need?
(RANK "1", "2", "3", ETC. IF MORE THAN ONE APPLIED)

(a) ___ Services are too expensive
(b) ___ Services are too far away
(c) ___ Tenants can't be bothered
(d) ___ Tenants are too independent to ask for help
(e) ___ Lack of information
(f) ___ Language difficulty
(g) ___ Stigma attached to seeking help
(h) ___ Tenants deny they have any needs
(i) ___ Lack of motivation
(j) ___ Lack of recognition of needs
(k) ___ Inability to approach agencies/organizations
(l) ___ Don't know
(m) ___ Other (specify): ____
____

21. To what extent do some tenants use services they don't need.
(CIRCLE ONE)

1. Not at all - (GO TO QUESTION 22)
2. Only a little
3. A great deal
4. Don't know

22. Why (if ever) do some tenants use services that they don't need?

23. Do housing project staff help tenants decide on their needs for services? (CIRCLE ONE)

1. Yes (specify how)

____

____

2. No
3. Don't know

24. Do housing project staff help tenants obtain the available services? (CIRCLE ONE)

1. A great deal
2. A fair amount
3. Only a little
4. Not at all
5. Don't know

25. Do you feel that staff of the housing project could do more to help tenants get the services they need? (CIRCLE ONE)

1. Yes, could do more (specify how):

____

____

2. No, that is the individual tenant's responsibility
3. No, that is the responsibility of the service agencies/organizations
4. No, that is the responsibility of family and friends
5. No, staff of the housing project providing sufficient help

26. In general, do you feel that you are able to learn about tenant problems soon enough to take appropriate action? (CIRCLE ONE)

    1. Usually find out about problems quite soon (GO TO QUESTION 28)
    2. Sometimes do not find out about them right away
    3. Only hear about problems when crises arise

27. How could these problems be identified earlier?

28. In what ways could project management assist in service delivery in housing projects?

29. Would an on-site multi-service facility in public housing projects aid or improve service delivery? (CIRCLE ONE)

    1. Yes
    2. No
    3. Don't know

30. Is there a neighbourhood planning mechanism (committee, etc.) available in the area where this project is located? (CIRCLE APPROPRIATE ANSWERS)

    1. Yes... Is it effective?
        1. Yes, very effective
        2. Yes, somewhat effective
        3. No, not effective
    2. No... Is one needed?
        1. Yes ...Why? ____________________
        2. No ....Why? ____________________
    3. Don't know

31. How frequently do the following problems present major obstacles to your work or the work of your agency/organization? Would you say often, sometimes, rarely or never? (CIRCLE ONE ANSWER FOR EACH OF (a) TO (j))

	Often	Sometimes	Rarely	Never
(a) Long waiting lists for referrals to other services to be processed	1	2	3	4
(b) Lack of coordination between community services serving residents of the focus housing project	1	2	3	4
(c) Lack of clarity of agencies' roles	1	2	3	4
(d) Clients are unaware of services	1	2	3	4
(e) Clients see services as stigmatizing (stigma attached to seeking help)	1	2	3	4
(f) Clients see services as producing undesirable (in their view) results	1	2	3	4
(g) Lack of client motivation (frustration, apathy)	1	2	3	4
(h) Clients see services as admission of helplessness	1	2	3	4
(i) Lack of client confidence to approach agencies/organizations	1	2	3	4
(j) Inadequacies in the assessment process	1	2	3	4

SECTION 4: YOUR ROLE AND THAT OF YOUR AGENCY IN THE PROJECT AND AREA

Your Role

32. How frequently: (ANSWER EACH OF (a) TO (c) USING THE CODES BELOW)

	At least 2 or 3 times per week	About once a week	2 or 3 times a month	Once a month or so	Less than once a month	Never
(a) Are you in the project for purposes of your service delivery work with specific clients?	1	2	3	4	5	6
(b) Do you meet with housing project staff regarding your service delivery work?	1	2	3	4	5	6
(c) Do you engage in case conferencing with other service providers about the same cases in this project?	1	2	3	4	5	6

What do you see as your major responsibilities and duties?

33. How long have you been:

(a) Working for this agency/organization? ________ (Years) ________ (Months)

(b) Doing this type of work? ________ (Years) ________ (Months)

(c) Working in this neighbourhood? ________ (Years) ________ (Months)

Your Agency/Organization Role

34. (a) Could you please list the range of services offered by your agency/organization?

(b) What type of service does your agency/organization provide in this project?

(c) What services provided by your agency/organization are most effective for:

Seniors:

Families:

(d) What services provided by other agencies/organizations are most effective for:

Seniors:

Families:

35. What area does your agency/organization serve? (CIRCLE ONE)

1. Province
2. County
3. Municipality
4. Neighbourhood
5. Project only
6. Province
7. Other (specify): ______________________

36. How long has your agency/organization been operational in this area?

______ (Years) ______ (Months)

37. Have there been any changes in the services you provide over this time period? (CIRCLE ONE)

1. Yes (Please explain): ______________________
____
2. No

38. How many persons are employed by your agency/organization or the branch that serves this project? (SPECIFY NUMBER)

(a) ______ Full-time (all categories professional and support)

(b) ______ Part-time (all categories professional and support)

ISBN 0-7729-1908-9